

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 205
 Diab, Wael Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 LLDP requires SNMP definitions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Introduce SNMP defs
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 We eagerly await your proposed text.

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 204
 Diab, Wael Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The GDMO definitions are missing. I would request that we complete this prior to completing WG Ballot and launching SA Ballot
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include Annex 30A and 30B
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 We eagerly await your proposed text.

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 16
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 4P
 4P operation is not described. If this is not specified in 802.3at, an industry standard or proprietary scheme could emerge displacing this amendment. It is undesirable to make another revision on PoE (PoE++) to repair this.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Send this back to the TF to complete the work on 4P. This has impact on the PSE, PD, management and L2 power management. Let's do it right this time.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB. This is how we handled the 4P comments in D3.0:
 REJECT.
 The group feels that finishing 2P is the priority and 4P will be address after that time, since the concept is that 4P = 2 x 2P.

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 182
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The response to my comment #467 against D3.0 is unsatisfactory.
 There is no indication in the current draft as to whether the work was implemented or not
 SuggestedRemedy
 Provide positive indication within the draft as to which version of 802.3Rev this draft is calculated against.
 That is, there should be either a cover page note or an opening editors note that indicates that this draft version "provides specific changes to P802.3Rev (expected to become IEEE Std 802.3-2008) as calculated against P802.3Rev/D?."?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add an opening editors note that indicates that this draft version "provides specific changes to P802.3Rev (expected to become IEEE Std 802.3-2008) as calculated against P802.3Rev/D?."?

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 195
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

PD equipment that is covered in the Code of Conduct on Energy Consumption of Broadband Equipment (from the EUROPEAN COMMISSION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL, JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE, Institute for the Environment and Sustainability, Renewable Energies Unit) will need to stay within the bounds of Type 1 power limits.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all specifications for Type 2 devices and reformulate the standard to only support devices which meet the EC Code of Conduct on Energy Consumption of Broadband Equipment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Although some Ethernet equipment is covered under the Code of Conduct on Energy Consumption of Broadband Equipment, it is by no means comprehensive and many types of Ethernet equipment fall outside of the scope of that specific Code of Conduct. For example, equipment covered by the Code of Conduct on Data Centres, published by the same body is not expected to be covered by the Broadband Code of Conduct.

Furthermore, if the commenter examines the Code of Conduct on Energy Consumption of Broadband Equipment he will find that power delivered by the PSE is specifically excluded by section A.5 ("Power delivered to other equipment (e.g. over USB or PoE) shall not be included in power consumption assessment").

Lastly, the Code of Conduct on Energy Consumption of Broadband Equipment specifies ONU equipment that exceeds 12.95W (e.g. 10Gb/s point-to-point or point-to-multipoint interfaces). It may be expected that some implementations of such devices will include power supplied over Ethernet from the home gateway device to the optical interface at the demarcation point. As such, this is a prime application of PoE that helps justify the broad market potential for the project.

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 169
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This set of comments is against P802.3at/D3.1 WG Ballot 1st recirculation

SuggestedRemedy

None. for document control purposes of this comment file only

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Bogus comment.

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 62
Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type T Comment Status D lunbal

The current unbalance requirements should be described in subclause 33.3.1 or 33.3.2 instead of 33.3.5 (PD Classifications).

SuggestedRemedy

Move the sentence:
"Type 2 PDs shall meet the requirements of 25.4.4a in the presence of (lunbal / 2)." to the end of paragraph 33.3.2 (PD Types).
Replace "lunbal" with "lunb".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ed note: improperly labeled for Clause and Page, should be against 33.3.5 pg76, ln31.

move sentence to 33.3.2.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 00 SC 00 P L # 242
 Rannow, Randy k Tyco Electronics

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Multiple instances of behaviour vs behavior

SuggestedRemedy

Make the document consistent using the British variant or the evolved Middle English wording.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This text is in Clause 30 and checking 30.8, 30.9, 30.10, 30.11 this is the style used in that section. Comment editor doesn't feel it is necessary to change the spelling of behavior in Clause 33 to match that in Clause 30.

 This is the wrong answer but the work was done; delete when reject is accepted

Search and replace behaviour with behavior - though this can't guarantee consistency throughout the whole 802.3 document.

- Pg 27, ln 19, ln 30, ln 45
- pg 28, ln 7, ln 19, ln 29, ln 42
- pg 29, ln 1, ln 13, ln 26, ln 37, ln 47
- pg 30, ln 25, ln 37, ln 48
- pg 31, ln 10, ln 25, ln 38, ln 47
- pg 32, ln 7, ln 19, ln 30, ln 44
- pg 33, ln 1, ln 11, ln 22

Cl 00 SC 00 P18 L10 # 243
 Rannow, Randy k Tyco Electronics

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment against 25.4, set to 00 to facilitate import
 During the Plenary mtg in Denver, I understood from the Task Force that the OCL will remain a "shall" statement and that the worst case transformer droop statement would be optional or an alternative metric. Grammtically it appears the equivalent system time constant is a shall statement:

A PHY in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD shall meet the Open Circuit Inductance (OCL) requirement in 9.1.7 of TP-PMD or have an equivalent system time constant that exceeds 2.4 usecs (for the PSE) or 7.0 usecs (for the PD) when transmitting the Data Dependent Jitter (DDJ) packet of TP-PMD A.2.

SuggestedRemedy

A PHY in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD shall meet the Open Circuit Inductance (OCL) requirement specified in 9.1.7 of TP-PMD. Alternatively, a PHY in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD may posses an equivalent system time constant that exceeds 2.4 us (for the PSE) or 7.0 us (for the PD) when transmitting the Data Dependent Jitter (DDJ) packet of TP-PMD A.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A PHY in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD shall EITHER meet the Open Circuit Inductance (OCL) requirement in 9.1.7 of TP-PMD or have an equivalent system time constant that exceeds 2.4 usecs (for the PSE) or 7.0 usecs (for the PD) when transmitting the Data Dependent Jitter (DDJ) packet of TP-PMD A.2.

Additionally, the transformer and channel adhoc has been working on this text so there may be more changes that we want to incorporate into this comment response.

Changed Clause to 00 to facilitate import. 25 is not allowed by the tool yet and the comment editor needs to look into how to allow this for the future.

Also, comment is against page 19, Ln 11.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 00 SC 00 P19 L10 # 112
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Clause 25 subclause 4.4a, changed to 00 to facilitate import
The PD time constant was set to 7.0 us in order to ensure interoperability with legacy PHYs when midspans are used.

More PD ports are expected to ship than midspan ports. Requiring PDs to add cost to support midspans is the incorrect tradeoff.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change the text in this clause to:
A PHY in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD shall meet the Open Circuit Inductance (OCL) requirement in 9.1.7 of TP-PMD or have an equivalent system time constant that exceeds 2.4 us when transmitting the Data Dependent Jitter (DDJ) packet of TP-PMD A.2.

2) Ensure interoperability by:
a) Using the work of the Transformer and Channel ad hoc to show that interoperability concerns are not probable and therefore can be ignored.

If this solution is accepted then no additional text is required.

b) Require midspans to reduce the current unbalance to legacy levels (3% of 350 mA).

If this solution is required, the Editor should insert the following text in the appropriate place:
Midspans shall regulate channel unbalance currents to less than or equal to 10.5 mA.

c) Use a combination of a and b above. This would permit higher unbalance currents and lower than OCL.
If this solution is required, the Editor should insert the following text in the appropriate place:
Midspans shall regulate channel unbalance currents to less than or equal to TBD mA.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

BUT, this will require group discussion.

Changed Clause to 00 to facilitate import. 25 is not allowed by the tool yet and the comment editor needs to look into how to allow this for the future.

Cl 00 SC 00 P19 L13 # 167
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Comment against 25.4.4a, set to 00 to facilitate import

Although the term "TP-PMD" is heavily used and properly referenced in cl 25 of the main standard, the term does not appear in the abbreviations.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "TP-PMD Twisted Pair, Physical Media Dependent (ANSI X3.263-1995)" to the 802.3 main definitions sub-clause (Service to humanity).

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Changed Clause to 00 to facilitate import. 25 is not allowed by the tool yet and the comment editor needs to look into how to allow this for the future.
Comment Type empty, set to E by default

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P17 L11 # 171
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change Name of this defined device so that the various old & new definitions of midspans are grouped together in the definitions section

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
"10BASE-T/100BASE-TX Midspan PSE"
To:
"Midspan, Alt B"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

How about:

"Midspan PSE, 10BASE-T/100BASE-TX:"
and
"Midspan PSE, 1000BASE-T:" for Line 8

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P17 L13 # 207
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The definitions for 1-Event and 2-Event signatures reference 1-Event and 2-Event classification respectively. Since 1-Event and 2-Event classification isn't defined these definitions are really very helpful.

SuggestedRemedy

Either provide complete definitions or delete.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add:

1.4.x 1-Event Classification: the application of a single class event during PI probing as described in Clause 33.2.8.

1.4.x 2-Event Classification: the application of two class events during PI probing as described in Clause 33.2.8.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P17 L21 # 79
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Definition:

1.4.x Type 1 PSE: A PSE that is designed to support a Type 1 PD. (See Clause 33)

This is not precise, as a Type 2 PSE clearly meets this definition. Furthermore, the reference to design intent is not really appropriate; the standard specifies externally observable behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

Restrict scope of definition:

1.4.x Type 1 PSE: A PSE that supports only Type 1 PDs. See Clause 33.

Similar adjustments can be made to the Type 2 PSE definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P17 L8 # 170
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change Name of this defined device so that the various old & new definitions of midspans are grouped together in the definitions section

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

"1000BASE-T Midspan PSE"

To:

"Midspan, Alt A"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 171

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P17 L31 # 206
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Please use same format as existing VLAN reference in IEEE Std 802.3-2005 subclause 1.5, also don't need to date the reference, I doubt that the definition of LLPD will change with new editions of IEEE Std 802.1AB.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'Link Layer Discovery Protocol from IEEE Std 802.1ABT-2005' to read 'Link Layer Discovery Protocol (see IEEE Std 802.1ABT)'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30 P L # 166
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Please consider this comment after all other L2 comments have been resolved. This is because this comment affects the entire document and hence if this comment is accepted it should be incorporated into the new draft only after all other changes have been incorporated

When we defined the new mirroring scheme in Denver, we did not use the naming convention that was followed by all the other variables. Some senior members pointed out that "mirrored" nomenclature is used to reflect change on a local system to the remote system. We need to fix the naming so as to be consistent with this nomenclature.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the following changes throughout the document including figures and tables:

aReceivedDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue => aMirroredDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue
ReceivedPSEAllocatedPowerValue => MirroredPSEAllocatedPowerValue

aMirroredDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue => aDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValueFromPD
MirroredPSEAllocatedPowerValue => PSEAllocatedPowerValueFromPD

aEchoedDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue => aMirroredDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValueFromPD
EchoedPSEAllocatedPowerValue => MirroredPSEAllocatedPowerValueFromPD

aReceivedDLLPDRRequestedPowerValue => aMirroredDLLPDRRequestedPowerValue
ReceivedPDRRequestedPowerValue => MirroredPDRRequestedPowerValue

aMirroredDLLPDRRequestedPowerValue => aDLLPDRRequestedPowerValueFromPD
MirroredPDRRequestedPowerValue => PDRRequestedPowerValueFromPD

aEchoedDLLPDRRequestedPowerValue => aMirroredDLLPDRRequestedPowerValueFromPD
EchoedPDRRequestedPowerValue => MirroredPDRRequestedPowerValueFromPD

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.2.1 P21 L4 # 186
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Current text for oPSE description in 30.2.2.1 "Text description of managed objects" is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Change text "oPSE" in 30.2.2.1 to read
oPSE

The managed object of that portion of the containment trees shown in Figure 30-3, Figure 30-4, and Figure 30-5. The attributes actions and notifications defined support the status detection, provisioning and management of power supplied to connected PDs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.2.1 P21 L4 # 185
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

We need to add a new text description in 30.2.2.1 "Text description of managed objects"

SuggestedRemedy

Add text to go after "oPAF" in 30.2.2.1 that says
oPD

The managed object of that portion of the containment trees shown in Figure 30-3, Figure 30-4, and Figure 30-5. The attributes contained within the oPD managed object support power management for Type 2 PDs and, optionally, for Type 1 PDs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.3 P22 L10 # 63
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There is a mixture of Times and Arial fonts in the diagrams clause references.

SuggestedRemedy

Make all fonts agree. Pick Times or Arial.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.2.3 P22 L 33 # 183
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Figure 30-3
 The containing relationship line for the new oPD object should come out of the bottom of the containing object, oPHYEntity, not the side
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please fix, there is plenty of room to do it correctly.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.4 P24 L 6 # 184
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Figure 30-5
 I am unclear as to why this figure is in the draft as it seems to be unchanged from what is in the present standard.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove or make more clear why it is included in the draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.3 P24 L 3 # 209
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 I don't see any change to Figure 30-5 and don't see any need for a change.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove from draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P24 L 37 # 210
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 This text states that 'For managed PSEs and PDs, the PSE Basic Package is mandatory, and the PSE Recommended Package is optional, and the PD Basic Package is mandatory.'
 For a managed PD why would the PSE Basic Package be mandatory, and the PSE Recommended Package be optional. Likewise why would the PD Basic Package be mandatory for a managed PSE.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text to read 'For managed PSEs, the PSE Basic Package is mandatory, and the PSE Recommended Package is optional. For managed PDs, the PD Basic Package is mandatory.'
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.4 P24 L 6 # 172
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 30-5
 (We have not discussed this in comment resolution but I believe we have a new situation which is not shown here.)
 It is now (arguably) legitimate to have a midspan powered by a Type 2 PD which, in turn then powers (one or more) Type 1 PDs
 SuggestedRemedy
 Also show an oPD object as (optionally) contained within the oMidSpan.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P24 L 37 # 168
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 All of paragraph 2
 There is no cross dependency of the packages between PSE and PD since they are implemented separately. At best this paragraph is confusing and at worst wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Separate into two paragraphs, one that has the package requirements for PSEs and another that has the (entirely separate) package requirements for PDs.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 Comment Type empty, set to E by default

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P24 L 44 # 211
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The DLL Power Classification packages are only conditional for managed PDs and PSEs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace lines 44 to 48 with: 'If a managed PD implements DLL then the conditional DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package shall be implemented. If a managed PSE implements DLL then the conditional DLL PSE Power Classification Basic Package shall be implemented.'

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P24 L 45 # 191
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The text of paragraph 3 does not reflect the long standing consensus of the group. That is, all Type 2 PDs shall implement "DLL". I believe that this is required in order to fulfil the requirements of the 3rd option on pg 57, lines 51-54.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read:
 "The DLL Power Classification Packages for PSEs and PDs are conditional. For a Type 1 or Type 2 PSE that implements DLL to be conformant to this standard, it shall fully implement the DLL PSE Power Classification Basic Package. For a Type 1 that implements DLL or for a Type 2 PD to be conformant to this standard, it shall fully implement the DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P25 L 29 # 64
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"MidSpan managed object class" and "PSEGroup managed object class" do not apply to PDs, even though the fields are not greyed out in the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Grey out the PD Basic Package column and the DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package column in the "MidSpan managed object class" and "PSEGroup managed object class."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P25 L 3 # 208
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

We do not use the term PoE anywhere in Clause 33 and therefore we should not be using it in the Management clause realted to Clause 33.

SuggestedRemedy

Page 25, line 3 - Change 'PoE Capabilities' to read 'DTE Power via MDI Capabilities'.
 Page 27, line 3 - Change 'Management for Power over Ethernet (PoE)' to read 'Management for DTE Power via MDI'.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P25 L 6 # 212
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The DLL PSE Power Classification Basic Package and the DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package are part of the PSE and PD objects respectively.

SuggestedRemedy

- [1] Change 'DLL PSE Power Classification Basic Package' to read 'PSE DLL Power Classification Package'.
- [2] Change 'DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package' to read 'PD DLL Power Classification Package'.
- [3] In Table 30-4 move the 'PSE DLL Power Classification Package' column to be beside the 'PSE Recommended Package' column with a thin line in-between.
- [4] In Table 30-4 move the 'PD DLL Power Classification Package' column to be beside the 'PD Recommended Package' column with a thin line in-between.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P26 L 32 # 213
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status X

aPDID, aDLLPowerType, aDLLPDPowerPriority and aPDModelNumber appear in both the PD Basic Package and the DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove aPDID, aDLLPowerType, aDLLPDPowerPriority and aPDModelNumber from the DLL PD Power Classification Basic Package and order them to be the first four attributes in the table for the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.9 P26 L 23 # 133
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The behavior of power priority MIB variable was changed during the last commenting cycle. Section 30.9 has not been updated to reflect this.

SuggestedRemedy

Split up aMirroredDLLPDPowerPriority into two MIB variables: aDLLPDPowerPriority (GET-SET) and aMirroredDLLPowerPriority (GET).

aDLLPDPowerPriority

A GET operation returns the priority of the PD system that is assigned by the PSE.
A SET operation changes the priority of the PD system that is assigned by the PSE to the indicated value.

aMirroredDLLPowerPriority

A GET operation returns the priority of the PD system that is requested by the PD.

Split up aDLLPDPowerPriority into two MIB variables: aDLLPDPowerPriority (GET-SET) and aMirroredDLLPowerPriority (GET).

aDLLPDPowerPriority

A GET operation returns the priority of the PD system that is requested by the PD.
A SET operation changes the priority of the PD system that is requested by the PD to the indicated value.

aMirroredDLLPowerPriority

A GET operation returns the priority of the PD system that is assigned by the PSE.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9 P27 L 13 # 192
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

And all subsequent instances of the same sort of thing (this will apply to all newly defined or amended objects and attributes associated with PoE)

There is none of the required supporting text for any of the attributes defined in 30.9.1 and 30.9.2 as is normally provided as augmentations to Annex 30A and 30B. (The 802.3 SNMP motion of 11/07 does not lift the well established and normal project requirement for including this text.)

SuggestedRemedy

Provide additional required text in the well established format.

AND

Provide the new or additional ASN.1 encoding values for each attribute as required.

-Note that OID final ARC values are not normally added to the otherwise complete text until the initial Sponsor Ballot Draft.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.9 P28 L # 122
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The behavior definitions for the different power values need to be consistent

SuggestedRemedy

aDLLPRequestedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PD requested power value that the local system has currently requested from the remote system. PD requested power value is the maximum input average power that the PD will ever draw under this power allocation if accepted. The requested PD power value is encoded according to Equation (33–17), where X is the decimal value of aDLLPRequestedPowerValue.

aReceivedDLLPRequestedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PD requested power value received from the remote system. Definition and encoding of PD requested power value is same as described in 30.9.2.1.7

aMirroredDLLPRequestedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PD requested power value that the local system mirrors back to the remote system. This is the PD requested power value that was used by the local system to compute the power that it has currently allocated to the remote system. The definition and encoding of PD requested power value is same as described in 30.9.2.1.7.

aEchoedDLLPRequestedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PD requested power value received from the remote system. This is the PD requested power value that was used by the remote system to compute the power value that it has currently allocated to the local system. The definition and encoding of PD requested power value is same as described in 30.9.2.1.7.

aDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PSE allocated power value that the local system has currently allocated to the remote system. The PSE allocated power value is the maximum input average power that the PSE wants the PD to ever draw under this allocation if it is accepted. The power value is encoded according to equation Equation (33–18), where X is the decimal value of aDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue.

aReceivedDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PSE allocated power value received from the remote system. The definition and encoding of PSE allocated power value is same as described in 30.9.1.1.19.

aMirroredDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PSE allocated power value that the local system mirrors back to the remote system. This is the PSE allocated power value that was used by the local system to compute the power that it has currently requested from the remote system. The definition and encoding of PSE allocated power value is same as described in

30.9.1.1.19.

aEchoedDLLPSEAllocatedPowerValue

A GET attribute that returns the PSE allocated power value received from the remote system. This is the PSE allocated power value that was used by the remote system to compute the power value that it has currently requested from the local system. The definition and encoding of PSE allocated power value is same as described in 30.9.1.1.19.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9.1 P27 L6 # 173
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status X

By established convention, managed object class headings in clause 30 are supposed to have descriptive text.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text at line 6:
"This subclause formally defines the behaviours for the oPSE managed object class attributes and actions."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9.1.1.21 P29 L24 # 80
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

There is only a place holder defining the increment rate of aLostCommunication counter.

SuggestedRemedy

Determine what the rate should be, and replace the 'X' placeholder on lines 24 and 34

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.9.1.1.23 P L # 187
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Tables and actual encoding values do not belong in Clause 30.9
The information, i.e. the actual values returned, the value type and the value range are information that belong in Annex30B in line with my earlier comment

SuggestedRemedy

Delete last sentence of behavior and Table 30-6 and put the equivalent information in the appropriate form (not a table, rather a register definition) into Annex30B

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9.2 P 30 L 15 # 174
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status X

By established convention, managed object class headings in clause 30 are supposed to have descriptive text.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text at line 15:
"This subclause formally defines the behaviours for the oPD managed object class attributes."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9.2.1.1 P 30 L 26 # 65
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Reference to "PDID" should be a reference to "aPDID."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "PDID" with "aPDID."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.9.2.1.11 P 32 L 42 # 81
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

There is only a place holder defining the increment rate of aLostCommunication counter.

SuggestedRemedy

Determine what the rate should be, and replace the 'X' placeholder on lines 42 and 53

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30A P 34 L 1 # 200
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The management portion of the draft has improved significantly this round but it is incomplete and still needs work. Specifically, there has been no text whatsoever provided for the required normative material in Annex 30A (and there has been no action by 802.3 to relieve a project of its requirement to provide this material as an integral portion of a complete draft)

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate text to Annex 30A to support the new and revised text that supports PoE+ in clause 30.
(I expect to be able to provide at least a start on such text by the time of the meeting in Seoul.)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30B P 34 L 2 # 201
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The management portion of the draft has improved significantly this round but it is incomplete and still needs work. Specifically, there has been no text whatsoever provided for the required normative material in Annex 30B (and there has been no action by 802.3 to relieve a project of its requirement to provide this material as an integral portion of a complete draft)

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate text to Annex 30B to support the new and revised text that supports PoE+ in clause 30 and Annex 30A.
(I expect to be able to provide at least a start on such text by the time of the meeting in Seoul.)

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P35 L 12 # 175
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The sense of the term "supply/draw power" is inverted from the rest of the paragraph. That is, in the first sentence the PD goes before the PSE. Please align.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "supply/draw power"
To: "draw/supply power"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P35 L 20 # 176
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Item "c" is incorrect. The issue is not whether or not a device "requires" power. Rather, it is whether or not it "requests" power from the host system.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "c" to read:
"A protocol allowing the detection of a device that requests power from a PSE."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P35 L 30 # 177
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The text here is incorrect. It is not the consequences of "powering" such devices. We don't even know whether or not "other" devices can be powered. The issue is whether or not it is appropriate to apply power (especially "DTE Power") at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text from: "...consequences of powering such devices,"
To: "...consequences of applying power to such devices,"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Powering and applying power are equivalent to this reader.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P35 L 48 # 229
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This line states that 'The use of other IEEE 802.3 MDIs is beyond the scope of this standard.' Since 10GBASE-T is likely to be the last PHY that supports UTP structured wiring, and we already support all cabling types that 10GBASE-T uses, rather than leave it for yet another project to come back and re-visit, can we please state either if we do or do not support 10GBASE-T links.

SuggestedRemedy

State if DTE Power via MDI does or does not support 10GBASE-T links.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Stating that we do not support 10GBASE-T links will not prevent another project to re-visit the topic if the need arises in the future or improved methods come to exist after the completion of the standard.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P36 L 19 # 178
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Now that we have a "closed end" one way medium hooked to the MDI/PI it might be a good idea to have one of the turned around so that they can hook together at their SS point.

SuggestedRemedy

Flip the medium over in this diagram so that the SS is on the left (to conceptually "hook up" to the other handed medium depictions in 33-2 & 33-2)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P36 L 19 # 216
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The left side of the medium box in Figures 33-1, 33-2 and 33-3 aren't consistent with the existing figures - see IEEE Std 802.3-2005 Figure 21-1 as an example.

SuggestedRemedy

The left edge of the medium should be offset from the MDI box, not aligned as it is at the moment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Show Fig21-1.jpg as an example.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P36 L 28 # 218
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

I don't think the term permitted is the best, we can't stop anybody from building anything, what we do however get to define is what is, and what is not, conformant to the standard. Further the statement seems to read that only the MDIs listed AND a PD or PSE is permitted - which implies that a Midspan PSE which does not contain a MDI - is not permitted - and we seem to be mixing terms here - the PoE equivalent of MDI is PI.

SuggestedRemedy

I suspect what we ant to say is that PD and Endspan PSE PIs need to be associated with a 10/100/1000BASE-T MDI. Based on this delete page 36 lines 28 to 30 and change page 37 line 21 from 'In an Endpoint PSE and in a PD the PI is encompassed within the MDI.' to read 'In an Endpoint PSE and in a PD the PI shall be encompassed within a 10BASE-T, 100BASE-T or 1000BASE-T MDI.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

snip of IM with commenter:

...because in AF we didn't intend to FORCE data on the link

1.4.212 Medium Dependent Interface (MDI): The mechanical and electrical or optical interface between the transmission medium and the MAU (e.g., 10BASE-T) or the PHY (e.g., 1000BASE-T) and also between the transmission medium and any associated (optional per IEEE 802.3, Clause 33) Powered Device (PD) or Endpoint Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE).

Hmm - circular.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L 39 # 19
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The first parameter in Table 33-1 should be "Maximum DC current and not "Maximum DC cable current" due to the fact that there are cables with 50 and more pairs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change parameter name for item 1 from: "Maximum DC cable current"

To

"Maximum DC current"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 193

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L 39 # 193
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 33-1 "Maximum DC Cable Current" is not the actual maximum cable current nor the actual maximum "System Parameter", rather it is the maximum DC Cable Current that is permitted to be requested by the PD and the nominal current of the system. Rather it is the minimum guaranteed current required to be supplied by the PSE (at minimum voltage) to meet the specification. In order to actually meet this specification, there must be some allowance for tolerances. this table has no allowance for tolerances and seems to actually impose zero tolerance limits.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Maximum DC Cable Current" to "Nominal highest DC cable current".
 Change "Channel DC pair loop resistance" to "Channel maximum DC pair loop resistance"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L 40 # 82
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ez

Units are "W" when they should be Ohms.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix units.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L 42 # 179
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 33-1
 Make the reference to the specified cabling more specific.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from: "UTP per Clause 14"
 To: "UTP per 14.4 & 14.5"
 Also, I think it would be a good idea and not out of line with our goals (especially considering work going on in P802.3az) to add a note reference, e.g. "UTP per 14.4 & 14.5*" <=note asterisk added

And then footnote the table to say: "**Class D recommended"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"UTP per 14.4 & 14.5*" <=note asterisk added

Add footnote the table to say: "**Class D recommended"

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L 44 # 18
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Note 1 should be coherent with Note 2 i.e. in note 2, Rch is the net resistance of a single twisted pair and so I_{cable} is the maximum output current allowed through Rch.
 In addition Note 1 contains error. The net current through a PI is zero....

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the current text of Note 1 and Note 2 with:

Note: Rch is the net result of the loop resistance of a single twisted pair. I_{cable} is the maximum current allowed through Rch in normal powering mode.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

It says maximum output current, not maximum net current.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P37 L 49 # 66
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Sections 33.1.4.1 and 33.1.4.2 could be combined into a single section, as they both describe specific cable considerations for Type 2 systems.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename 33.1.4.1 to "Type 2 system cabling" and delete the 33.1.4.2 section title.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Perform suggested remedy.
 Delete 33.1.4.2 on line 43
 scan text for references to 33.1.4.2 and replace with 33.1.4.1

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P37 L 53 # 215
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In respect to my comment #520 on the initial ballot, while I agree with the response that the note that my comment was against has been deleted I believe the issue addressed by the comment still exists.

I believe that ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D cabling, including a channel DC loop resistance of 25 Ohms, is equivalent to the Cat 5 cabling, not Cat 5e. I'm not sure why we seem to be precluding the use of Cat 5 when it is sufficient to support Type 2 operation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'These requirements are also met by Category 5e or better cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2.' to read 'These requirements are also met by Category 5 or better cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Type 2 operation requires Class D, or better, cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 with the additional requirement that channel DC loop resistance shall be 25 Ω or less. These requirements are also met by Category 5e or better cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2, ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2-1 and ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2-10 or Category 5 cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-A-1995 with the additional requirement that channel DC loop resistance shall be 25 Ω or less.

FYI:

The IEEE references for Category 5 cabling are
 >>ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-A-1995
 >>ISO/IEC 11801:1995 (Class D).

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P37 L 54 # 221
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[1] We use 'DC pair loop resistance' in Table 33-1 yet just 'DC loop resistance' in subclause 33.1.4.1. Also there is no definition of DC loop resistance in the standard, remember that 'A note to a table is not an official part of the standard..' (see IEEE-SA Style manual subclause 15.5).

SuggestedRemedy

[1] I understand the term used by ISO/IEC 11801 is 'Direct current (d.c.) loop resistance' so suggest we should use 'DC loop resistance' by changing Table 33-1.
 [2] Note 2 of Table 33-1 should be moved 33.1.4.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1]: we want Rch to be the loop resistance as it removes a factor of 2 from our equations.

How about adding clarification after In 53; "It should be noted that the cable references use DC loop resistance while this standard uses DC PAIR loop resistance resulting in a factor of 2 reduction of Rch in this standard."
 then add text of Note 2 after this sentence.

see 19, 19, 193

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P38 L3 # 105
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The August 2008 TIA42 meeting discussed reducing the cable derating for cables using 2-pairs out of the 4-pairs in a cat 5e cable. A lower derating would significantly benefit most PoE applications. See <http://ftp.tiaonline.org/tr-42/tr427/Public/2008/08-08%20San%20Francisco/>.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the text of section 33.1.4.2 as shown below:
Under worst case conditions, Type 2 operation requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable when all cable pairs are energized at the maximum DC cable current specified in Table 33-1, or a 5°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable when half of the cable pairs are energized at the maximum DC cable current specified in Table 33-1." Additional guidelines ...

The 5°C reduction, can be used as a placeholder until ISO and TIA details are provided. At that time the task force could removed the details for derating and just reference these standards.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

BUT this will require discussion

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P38 L5 # 180
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Requested change to track proposed change to Table 33-1, page 37,line 39.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Maximum DC Cable Current" to "highest DC cable current".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IFF #193 was accepted.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P38 L6 # 214
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

I assume that ISO/IEC TR 29125 was removed from the normative references subclause since it isn't normatively referenced. If that is the case it needs to appear in the bibliography found in Annex A as described on subclause 10.4.1 'Citation as a normative reference' which states 'If a reference is not specifically cited in the normative text of the document, then it shall not be listed in the normative references clause. In such cases, it shall be listed in the first or final informative annex, entitled Bibliography [see item h) below].'

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to a new set of changes to Annex A 'Bibliography':

[BX] ISO/IEC TR 29125 (draft), Information technology-Telecommunications cabling guidelines for remote powering of data terminal equipment. Draft document number ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 874.

[BY] TIA/EIA-TSBXXX (draft), Guidelines for Supporting Power Delivery over Balance Twisted-Pair Cabling. Draft document number TIA/EIA-TSBXXX

Change 'ISO/IEC TR 29125' to read 'ISO/IEC TR 29125 [BX]' and 'TIA/EIA-TSBXX, "Guidelines for Supporting Power Delivery over Balance Twisted-Pair Cabling." to read 'TIA/EIA-TSBXX [BY]'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P38 L6 # 217
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

We shouldn't be referring to 802.3at as this designation will become a superseded standard once it is consolidated into the base standard at some future Revision. In addition there is not such thing as a 'Type 2 cable'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'Additional guidelines for the ambient operating temperature of Type 2 cables for 802.3at applications are addressed in ISO/IEC TR 29125 ..' to read 'Additional cable ambient operating temperature guidelines for Type 2 operation are provided in ISO/IEC TR 29125 ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P38 L7 # 188
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The terms "ISO/IEC TR 29125" and "EIA-TSB-XX" are a complete mystery unless they show up in either the references (1.3) or the bibliography (Annex A).

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest that the body text is satisfactory as it is but that entries need to be put into the bibliography, Annex A.

As the TSB number is evidently not yet available, an editor's note should be added to the bibliography entry to indicate that the number will be added as soon as it is available.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See 214 (OBE)

an editor's note should be added to the bibliography entry to indicate that the number will be added as soon as it is available.

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P39 L3 # 223
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The text use to read 'PSE, as the name implies ..' however it was changed in the last draft to read 'PSE, as the abbreviation implies ..' however I don't see how the abbreviation implies anything, it is the unabbreviated name that implies something.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change to read 'Power sourcing equipment, as the name implies ..' or to read 'PSE, as the unabbreviated name implies ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 67

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P39 L3 # 189
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The text "PSE, as the abbreviation implies, is the equipment that provides the power to a single link section." is not sufficiently precise to accurately define the portion of the system under discussion.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text from:

"PSE, as the abbreviation implies, is the equipment that provides the power to a single link section."

To: "PSE, as the abbreviation implies, is the portion of the end station or midspan equipment that provides the power to a single link section."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

one definition of equipment: the collective designation for the articles comprising an outfit. (source: wiktionary.com)

Equipment doesn't refer to the whole appliance, just the part that performs the PSE function. Therefore, equipment is specific enough.

Additionally, this is legacy, information text. It has served well enough since adoption in 2005. The comment editor sees no reason to change.

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P39 L3 # 222
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Line 3 states the PSE '.. provides the power to a single link section.' yet line 4 states that a PSEs main function is to '.. supply power to the detected PD through the link section ..'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 3 to read '.. provides the power to a single PD.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P39 L3 # 67
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Quit hunting for the right descriptive term (name? acronym? abbreviation?). Remove the extraneous clause.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 PSE, as the abbreviation implies, is the equipment that ...

With:
 The PSE is the equipment that ...

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1 P67 L45 # 95
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The names Zac1 and Zac2 are a bit obscure for describing valid AC MPS signatures and invalid MPS signatures.

SuggestedRemedy
 Rename Zac1 as Zvalid and Zac2 as Zinvalid.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1 P67 L51 # 96
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Zac1 is a range, as is Zac2. It is imprecise to define a gray region between two gray regions:
 "A PSE may consider the AC MPS component to be either present or absent when it detects a AC impedance between the values Zac1 and Zac2 as defined in Table 33-12."

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 A PSE may consider the AC MPS component to be either present or absent when it detects a AC impedance between the values Zac1 and Zac2 as defined in Table 33-12.
 with:
 A PSE may consider the AC MPS component to be either present or absent when it detects an AC impedance between Zac1 max and Zac2 min.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

A PSE may consider the AC MPS component to be either present or absent when it detects an AC impedance between Zac1 max and Zac2 min [as defined in Table 33-12.]

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P68 L1 # 97
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There really isn't a need for both IMin1 and IMin2, as the key values can be combined into a single parameter.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace IMin1 and IMin2 with a new parameter, IMin, 5mA min, 10 mA max.

Replace the first 3 sentences of the section with the following:

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be present if IPort is greater than or equal to IMin max for a minimum of TMPS. A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be absent if IPort is less than or equal to IMin min. A PSE may consider the DC MPS component to be either present or absent if IPort is in the range of IMin.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Instruct the Editor to replace IMin1 with IHLD MIN, and IMin2 with IHLD MAX.
 [This avoids using a min min name.]

Replace section 33.2.11.1.2 text (lines 3 - 12) with the following:

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be present if IPort is greater than or equal to IHLD max for a minimum of TMPS. A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be absent if IPort is less than or equal to IHLD min. A PSE may consider the DC MPS component to be either present or absent if IPort is in the range of IHLD.

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be absent when it detects a DC current in the range IHLD min. Power shall be removed from the PI when DC MPS has been absent for a duration greater than TMPDO.

The specification for TMPS in Table 33-11 applies only to the DC MPS component. The PSE shall not remove power from the port when the DC current is greater than or equal to IHLD max for at least TMPS every TMPS + TMPDO, as defined in Table 33-11. This allows a PD to minimize its power consumption.

Replace the additional information in table 33-11, p62 with:
 Relevant for 33.2.11.1.2.

[see #48]

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P68 L3 # 48
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The content of the text regarding the MPS requirements in Table 33-11 item 18 and items 19 and 20 is not well synchronized with the text of 33.2.11.1.1.
 See attached possible interpretation permutaion table attached "MPS 33.2.11.1.2."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 33.2.11.1.2 with the following text:

33.2.11.1.2 .1 MPS Component is present

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be present and shall not remove power from the port in the following cases:

- a) if the DC current is greater than or equal to IMin2 max or
- b) if the DC current is greater than or equal to IMin2 max for at least TMPS every TMPS + TMPDO, as defined in Table 33-11.
 The current level during TMPDO may be lower than IMin2.
 This allows a PD to minimize its power consumption.

33.2.11.1.2 .2 MPS Component is present or absent

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be present or absent and may not remove power from the port in the following cases:

- c) if the DC current is within IMin2 range or
- d) if the DC current is within IMin2 for any t=Tx value, every Tx + TMPDO.
 The current level during TMPDO may be lower than IMin2.

33.2.11.1.2 .2 MPS Component is absent:

A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be absent and shall remove power from the port if the DC current is within the range of IMin1 for t>TMPDO

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

OBE #97.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.3 P44 L 50 # 34
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 4P

Draft 3.1

The standard should not preclude implementations that are using both alternative A and B due to the following reasons:

- a) It is out of scope of the standard to limit implementations that meets standard requirements.
- b) There are no interoperability issues if PD gets power from 2x 2 pairs power source if all pairs are coming from the same port/segment/PSE type 2. It is the load responsibility (PD) to meet the 2P specification for each 2P.
 (4P ad hoc recommendations)

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

"A PSE shall implement Alternative A or Alternative B, or both. While a PSE may be capable of both Alternative A and Alternative B, PSEs shall not operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously".

To:

"A PSE shall implement Alternative A or Alternative B, or both. While a PSE may be capable of both Alternative A and Alternative B, PSEs shall not deliver power on both Alternative A and Alternative B simultaneously on the same segment If Alternative A and Alternative B are operated from different link segments or different power systems or from Type 1 PSE.
 For Type 2 PSEs, simultaneous operation of Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment is out of scope of the standard."

In addition, in 33.3.1 page 50 line 42 modify the text to be:

"NOTE-PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that may simultaneously receive power from both Mode A and Mode B are out of scope of this standard."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. frs

This needs to be discussed.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P45 L 11 # 181
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Lines 11 & 12

The phrase "If power is to be applied" appears twice in one sentence. Once should be sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove one instance of "If power is to be applied"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

If power is to be applied, the PSE shall turn on power after a valid detection in less than Tpon as specified in Table 33-11.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P45 L 12 # 68
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Redundant "if power is to be applied" phrase.

SuggestedRemedy

Redundant "if power is to be applied" phrase.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs
 OBE 181

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P45 L 30 # 83
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It is commendable to try to point the reader to tables or sections wherein he will find details on a referenced variable or concept. But we do it ad nauseum.

For example, the first paragraph introducing the concept of backoff timing (Tdbo) and the possibility of AltA/AltB detect collision gives a pointer to the table containing the definition of Tdbo. Very nice.

But then no more than a few lines later, in the same section, we do it again. This is a waste of space and an unnecessary interruption to the flow of the document.

SuggestedRemedy

By all means, add forward references when appropriate. Add backward references if there is a reasonable expectation that the reader may have skipped the previous sections.

But do not continue adding pointers willy-nilly every time a term, variable, or opportunity to point out where a section may be found.

Delete these extraneous references to improve readability.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This needs to be discussed. The reference text appear below. The cross references are to the same table but for different parameters. The number of reference could be reduces as shown below. After task force agreement the Editor should be authorized to apply the same approach throughout this clause.

related to 21, 20.

Tdbo min as specified in Table 33-11 after the beginning of the first detection attempt. This ensures that an Alternative A PSE will complete a successful detection cycle prior to an Alternative B PSE present on the same link section that may have caused the invalid signature.

33.2.4.2 Conventions

The notation used in the state diagrams follows the conventions of state diagrams as described in 21.5.

33.2.4.3 Constants

The PSE state diagrams use the following constants (see Table 33-11):

- ICUT
- Overload current detection range [remove (see Table 33-11)]
- ILIM
- Output current at short circuit condition [remove (see Table 33-11)]
- Ilrush

Output current during startup (see [remove Table 33-11 and] Figure 33-15)

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.2 P45 L 48 # 21
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Startup is related to Figure 33-14 and not Figure 33-15

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 2 from .."and Figure 33-15" to ".. and Figure 33-14"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.3 P45 L 46 # 20
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Update the definition for ILIM by adding figure 33-15 as well

SuggestedRemedy

Change ILIM definition from:

"output current at short circuit condition (see Table 33-11)

To:

"output current at short circuit condition (see Table 33-11 and Figure 33-15)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

See 83

"output current at short circuit condition (see Figure 33-15)

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.3 P45 L 46 # 69
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The linrush variable references Figure 33-15, when in fact ILIM should reference that figure.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the "see Figure 33-15" reference from linrush to ILIM.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

OBE 20

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P46 L3 # 231
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Suggest that 'PSE does not perform 1-Event or 2-Event Physical Layer classification.'
 should read 'PSE does not perform Physical Layer classification.'

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P47 L30 # 228
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

'power_not_available' is not in correct alphabetical position in variable list.

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P47 L31 # 227
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The variable power_not_available states that it is asserted when the PSE is no longer capable of supplying the power required as defined by the PD Class. While this was okay in IEEE Std 802.3af-2003 I think this variable is now in conflict with the addition of Data Link Layer Classification

Consider a PD that is initially classified through Physical Layer classification as a Class 0 and the PSE allocates it 15.4W. Later, through Data Link Layer Classification, the PD negotiates down its requirement so the PSE would only ever need to allocate it 10W.

The definition of this variable however requires that it be asserted TRUE (forcing an exit from the POWER_ON state) if the 'PSE is no longer capable of sourcing sufficient power to support the PD Class of the attached PD' which in this case would be 15.4W and not 10W. This would seem to defeat the point of Data Link Layer Classification which should allow power shed by a PD to be allocated by the PSE elsewhere.

There is a similar problem when the PD request more power through Data Link Layer Classification since the PSE can treat the lower PD Class power requirement as the minimum it need allocate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '.. power to support the PD Class of the attached PD.' to read '.. power to support attached PD. Sufficient power is defined either by the PD Class of the attached PD, or by Data Link Layer classification which takes precedent.'

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Change the text '.. power to support the PD Class of the attached PD.' to read '.. power to support attached PD. Sufficient power is defined by classification--see 33.2.8.

[This points to the overview section for classification which also states precedence.]

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P47 L 6 # 40
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D inrush
 Draft D3.1

The definition of power_applied is not covering all cases for setting power_applied=True.

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 18 from":
 "..completed the ramp of voltage and is operating"

To:
 "..completed the ramp of voltage or Tinrush Timer is done and is operating"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

This should be discussed.

It will be difficult for a PSE to reliably determine when a voltage ramp is completed at the PD. A PD could change its capacitive loading at a specific MDI voltage and this would lead to additional inrush time.

A compliance tester could establish POWER_ON when linrush has become lpd_average and the PSE might use Tinrush as the method to assume inrush is over. This could lead to noncompliance issues that are not really an interoperability problem.

The proposed existing text requires the Tinrush timer to be expired before setting power_applied to TRUE. See 44 for a solution to this.

See 44, 46

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P48 L 8 # 232
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The performs_classification variable has been removed from the state diagram (it's function has been replaced by class_num_events) and no longer appears in the variable definition subclause other than in this table (33-3).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the performs_classification column from Table 33-3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P49 L 26 # 84
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

do_classification as a separate function is unnecessary. do_classification2 is adequate, if provision is made for Type 1 PSEs to assign Class 4 to Class 0.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete existing do_classification definition, rename do_classification2 as do_classification. Add a sentence to pd_requested_power description: "A Type 1 PSE that measures a Class 4 signature may assign that PD to Class 0."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

This an optimized version of the existing requirements.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L 10 # 230
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The addition of power_not_available to the exit conditions of TEST_MODE causes two problems.

[1] It could make existing implementation that are conformant to IEEE Std 802.3af-2003 non-conformant to IEEE Std 802.3at. While it may not be the best thing to do, IEEE Std 802.3af does permit a PSE to be in the TEST_MODE state even when it hasn't got sufficient power to supply a CLASS 0 PD - which is the only value a PD has to be assumed to be since classification doesn't occur prior to entry into the TEST_MODE state.

[2] Strictly speaking since classification doesn't occur prior to entry into the TEST_MODE state - and there is no assignment of a CLASS anywhere prior to entry to the state - the pervious calcification value - if any - should be used. This doesn't seem to be correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this additional reason for exit or provide additional logic that will grandfather in existing implementations while recommended the new option.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

The logic makes sense. The new condition was added during the IEEE 802.3at development.

Recommend removing the new condition or removing test mode all together.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L2 # 224
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If mr_pse_enable = disable AND removePower = true it is not clear from the state diagram if the PSE should enter the DISABLED or IDLE state. In addition it is not clear what value removePower will be at a Type 1 PSE that doesn't support DLL classification.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'remove_power' to read 'remove_power * mr_pse_enable = enable * pse_dll_capable'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This needs to be discussed. Note changes.

'removePower *(mr_pse_enable = enable) * pse_dll_capable'.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L20 # 150
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The transition condition from DETECT_EVAL to POWER_UP is satisfied only if pse is not dll capable (* !pse_dll_capable). This is in conflict with table 33-8 that allows Type-1 PSE with no classification to perform DLL classification

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the condition * !pse_dll_capable from the transition. Table 33-3 prevents Type-2 PSE from using no classification

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L3 # 25
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is not clear what is "E" at the input of the IDLE state

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify what is "E"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. frs

See page 52 L20.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L3 # 85
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"removePower" variable is undefined.

SuggestedRemedy

Copy definition from 33.6.6.2, adding reference, "see 33.6.6.2."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

The variable is on p106 L10. I assume the remedy is to create the variable in 33.2.4.4 and reference the defination on p106 L10.

OBE 225

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L3 # 225

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The variable removePower doesn't seem to be defined in subclause 33.2.4.4 Variables.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to subclause 33.2.4.4:

removePower

Interprocess variable supplied by the PSE power control state diagram (Figure 33-30) to indicate that the PSE must remove power from the PD due to loss of communications with the PD.

Values: FALSE: Power should not be removed from PD.
TRUE: Power to be removed by PSE.

Change the definition of removePower found in 33.6.6.2 (page 106, line 1) to mirror this, the new definition will read:

removePower

Interprocess variable supplied to the PSE state diagram (Figure 33-9) to indicate that the PSE must remove power from the PD due to loss of communications with the PD.

Values: FALSE: Power should not be removed from PD.
TRUE: Power to be removed by PSE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

The variable defined is removePower. Figure 33-30 should replace remove_power with removePower. Then perform the suggested remedy.

Interprocess variable supplied by the PSE power control state diagram (Figure 33-30) to indicate that the PSE must remove power from the PD due to loss of communications with the PD.

Values: FALSE: Power should not be removed from PD.
TRUE: Power to be removed by PSE.

Change the definition of removePower found in 33.6.6.2 (page 106, line 1) to mirror this, the new definition will read:

removePower

Interprocess variable supplied to the PSE state diagram (Figure 33-9) to indicate that the PSE must remove power from the PD due to loss of communications with the PD.

Values: FALSE: Power should not be removed from PD.

TRUE: Power to be removed by PSE.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L33 # 233

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D not clear

In IEEE Std 802.3af the path from DETECT_EVAL to POWER_DENIED was on taken IF the available power was less than 15.4W [pd_requested_power <= 2 in START_DETECTION and (pd_requested_power > pse_available_power) on transition] AND the PSE didn't do classification [* !performs_classification] AND the signature is valid [* (signature = valid)].

Since the transition condition now reads [(pd_requested_power > pse_available_power) + ..] the last two conditions, no classification and valid signature, have been removed.

This causes a number of conflicts:

[1] If there is a valid signature while the power available is less than 15.4 W it is not clear where to go to from the DETECT_EVAL states since the conditions to transition to POWER_DENIED and either CLASS_EV1 (if class_num_events = 2) or 1-EVENT_CLASS (if class_num_events = 1) will both be true.

[2] If there is an invalid or open circuit signature while the power available is less than 15.4 W it is not clear where to go to from the DETECT_EVAL states since the conditions to transition to SIGNATURE_INVALID and POWER_DENIED will both be true.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the condition '(pd_requested_power > pse_available_power)' to read '((pd_requested_power > pse_available_power) * (class_num_events = 0) * (signature = valid))'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

The condition checked to move from DETECT_EVAL to POWER_DENIED changed after AF but before D3.0.

This request is not clear to me and the remedy may be incomplete.

The same operation as AF is achieved by replacing the D3.1 statement with: "((pd_requested_power > pse_available_power) * (class_num_events = 0) * (signature = valid))"

The group should discuss why the variable ted_timer_not_done is checked. If this timer is done when the condition is tested, there is no exit path for the system. Therefore, a system with a (valid detection)* (no class)* (not enough power for the PD) is stuck in state DET_EVAL.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L45 # 53
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Due to the fact that our policy in many issues was to not incurage mis behaviour we need to disallow in the state diagram of the PSE and of the PD the possibility that Type 1 PD will request more power than 12.95 by using L2 classification when PD is connected to Type 2 PSE.

The fact that Type 1 PD that required more than 12.95W is not compliant to the standard doesnt help much due to the fact that the state machines takes precedence over text hence it will be interpreted as allowed by user.

SuggestedRemedy

Add exit from DLL_ENABLE state to POWER_DENIED state which will be activated when (mr_pd_class_detected<4)*pd_requested_power>12.95) or equivalent solution.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. frs

This needs to be discussed.

Do we want state diagrams to police miss behaviour or do we want them to reflect what shall require? For example, PSE need to be lower than the upper bound current template of Figure 33-15 but we do not have statements like: if ILIM circuit failure then blow fuse.

Consider both the L2 and PSE for a police-type fix.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L47 # 149
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The transition condition from POWER_ON to IDLE is missing logical AND with !option_vport_lim

SuggestedRemedy

Add the follwing to the transition condition *!option_vport_lim

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L49 # 44
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D inrush

Tinrush_timer_done is missing from the POWER_ON state to the ERROR_DELAY state. (In the previous draft TLIM was used for linrush and ILIM. Now we seperate those two functions hence we need to update this location too)

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Tinrush_timer_done" to the exit from POWER_ON state to the ERROR_DELAY state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This needs to be discussed.

Variable power_applied is TRUE after Tstartup has expired at which point steady state operation is assumed (see comment 40). Figure 33-11 only moves from state MONITOR_INRUSH to IDLE_INRUSH when power_applied is TRUE. Therefore, Tstartup will be done ~before it is reset.
 => A test for Tinrush_timer_done will cause an undesirable ERROR_DELAY.

Add the following condition to the POWER_ON to ERROR_DELAY path:
 "+ Tinrush_timer_done * (!port < linrush)".

Note that this prevents a PD from using its surge allowance until just after Tinrush has expired.

see 40, 46

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P51 L 6 # 151
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D review2

The behavior of powercycling the PD when you set mr_pse_enable = force power in the POWER_UP state is counter-intuitive. I do not think this behavior is correct.

SuggestedRemedy

If the force power state is set while in the POWER_UP state then the PD should continue to remain powered. Anyhow we cannot change legacy behavior. I would like to keep the behavior undefined in the case where power is forced when the port is already ON

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

See 86.

The AF spec. had this approach.
 When in POWER_ON if mr_pse_enable = force_power: the system moves to IDLE, where power is removed, then it moves to TEST_MODE where power is applied. This is not intuitive.

Remove "mr_pse_enable = force_power" from the test condition exiting state POWER_ON. This change should permit legacy behavior and enable moving from POWER_ON to TEST_MODE with the power remaining on.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P52 L 1 # 152
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D review2

Figure 33-10
 State Machine mandates that the PSE omits the second finger of the 2-finger classification if the first finger returns a value that is not equal to 4. This contradicts the text.

Also, the 1-EVENT_CLASS is exited only when the tpd_c_timer expires.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggested remedy is shown in the attachment avetteth_classification_SM.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

= Thanks for using a named figure.
 Next time please also highlight/bold what changes were made, and point to text that is contradicted.

This change provides two paths when class = 4. The old text prevents two fingers when the first figure was not 4. Both of these do not match the text:

p59, L39 If the result of the first class event is Class 4, the PSE may omit the subsequent mark and class events only if the PSE implements Data Link Layer classification.

Modify the proposed state diagram exit from CLASS_EV1 to read:
 tcle1_timer_done * !pse_skips_event

See 38, 86, 87

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P52 L10 # 38
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Draft D3.1

The following case is not covered by the state machine or by the text:

A type 2 PSE is connected to Type 1 PD

The PSE is doing 2 fingers.

(PSE can do:

- a) 2 fingers (covered by the state machine) or
- b) 1 finger + DLL (covered by the state machine) or
- c) 2 fingers + DLL (NOT covered by the state machine)

The first reading is 0,1,2 or 3 (it is Type 1 PD) but the 2nd reading is something else (it could be different due to the fact that the PD type 1 was not required to return the same class when it gets consecutive classification events)

So what to do in this case?

The logical thing to do is to ignore 2nd reading result so we are backward compatible with PD type 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Duplicate the state machine from A to C and make the relevant changes as described in the "revised figure 33-10"

In addition add the following text after line 35 page 35:

"A Type 2 PSE that is using two event classification and detects Type 1 PD, may classify the PD according to the result of the first class event only."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This needs to be discussed.

No figure was made available.

This concern is related to 87, 152, 86.

The time T_{pd} is and was 75 ms. Two event timing falls within this time period. Therefore, most PD would return the same class current for both fingers. Using the first finger only ensures predictable operation.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P52 L11 # 86
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The branch out of CLASS_EV1 that moves into MARK_EV1 requires that the PSE observes a Class 4 signature. It was not the intent, however, of the Task Force to force a PSE to not present the second class event if the PD is a Type 1 PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change branch condition from:

tcle1_timer_done * (mr_pd_class_detected = 4)

to:

tcle1_timer_done * !pse_skips_event2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

OBE 151

This concept works but also needs to modify the path to TYPE2_CLASS_DONE, and define the proposed variable.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P52 L19 # 87
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The branch out of CLASS_EV2 back to the IDLE state is trying to capture the situation wherein the two class signatures don't match. The way this is done presently requires that the PSE only does a 2-Event classification if the first class result is Class 4. A PSE can do 2-Event classification, though, no matter the signature. Thus, this diagram needs memory.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the beginning of CLASS_EV2 state:

first_class_result <= mr_pd_class_detected

Change exit condition from:

tcle2_timer_done * (mr_pd_class_detected < 4)

to:

tcle2_timer_done * (mr_pd_class_detected != first_class_result)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

See 86, 152, 138.

This concept ensures nonmatching classes reads end up going to IDLE.

More details are required to complete this remedy. Task the comment author to provide a complete remedy.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L1 # 88
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment #533 of D3.0 was not implemented in D3.1. This addresses the 5% duty cycle timer for Tovld.

SuggestedRemedy

Implement the state diagram and textual changes in landry_dutycycletimer.pdf. Replace tovld_timer_done variable with tovld_fault in Figure 33-9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

OBE 106.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L1 # 106
 Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The concerns made in D3.0 comment #533 were accepted but not addressed in D3.1.

----- Comment 533 is repeated below.-----

A PD is not permitted to consume ICUT for more than 5% of the time over a 1 second sliding window.

A PSE does not need to provide more than what a PD may use.

This comment is also related to comment on page 39.

Technical

An allowance for removing PI power needs to be provided without forcing a design requirement. All state diagrams shown in figure 33-11 have a concept of duty cycle. To avoid forcing design and in order to keep state diagrams simple, create a generic threshold and duty cycle monitor that can be used at any time to monitor PD allowances.

From reset, at any time the statemachine can be used to test the PD allowance. This generic state diagram would count Tover when the system operates above the threshold. The monitoring period, Tp, starts when the threshold is exceeded. If Tover/Tp exceeds the duty cycle before Tp expires, a FAULT condition exists.

To monitor Tovld, Ton counts Tovld counts and Tp = 1 second.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment and the attached figure "tovld.pdf." The figure shows one method to provide a sliding window of 1 second while monitoring the 5% duty cycle allowance for ICUT.

The ILIM diagram can stay as is because the new ICUT diagram covers most ILIM fault cases. The MPS diagram needs to be modified in order to support a duty cycle Tmps/(Tmps + Tmpdo). This state diagram can be provided at the Interim for discussion.

The goal here is to ensure that a PSE can monitor duty cycle specifications without forcing design requirements

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

See 88. The solutions in 88 and this comment can be compared to select the best one. Then the preferred method should be used to create a corrected MPS diagram.

Task the comment authors of 88 and 106 to propose a solution.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L 41 # 70
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Figure title does not mention the monitor inrush function.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "monitor inrush" to figure title.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L 42 # 22
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The title of Figure 33-11 is not complete
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from:
 "Figure 33-11-PSE monitor overload, monitor short, and monitor MPS state diagrams"
 To:
 "Figure 33-11-PSE monitor overload, monitor short, monitor MPS and moitor inrush state diagrams"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs
 OBE 70

Cl 33 SC 33.2.47 P53 L 38 # 43
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 It looks that the linrush state machine contain a potential problem. There is no exit from MONITOR_INRUSH state to IDLe STATE in case of a short at the output due to the fact that the MONITOR_SHORT is only activated when power_applied is true.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add an exit from MONITOR_INRUSH state to IDLE state. This exit is activated when error_condition variable is true.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 These SDs are independent of the main SD, Fig 33-9. They run independent and the main SD takes care of this condition.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5 P53 L 47 # 71
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "In an operational mode" sounds vague.
 SuggestedRemedy
 From:
 In an operational mode, the PSE ...
 To:
 In any operational mode, the PSE ...
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5 P53 L 53 # 47
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 The PSE operation may not be dependent of data link status
 SuggestedRemedy
 Restore the text from 802.3af with the following modifications and locate it after line 52:
 "The PSE operation may not be dependent of data link status"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT. frs
 This text was removed because end span PSE may use LLDP and type 2 PD shall use LLDP. Therefore, operation is dependent on link status.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P54 L 43 # 107
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Several improvements were made to the PSE validation circuit text. System designers will benefit by explicitly calling out something that is already implicitly required in section 33.4.1 Isolation.

SuggestedRemedy

The editor should selected the best location for the following proposed text for clause 33.

"The power source for the PSE that provides the detection voltage or current and power to the PD after detection of a valid PD detection signature shall be separate and electrically isolated from the power source(s) for the switch/hub or other port device."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This should be discussed.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P54 L 8 # 72
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The figure has voltage terminals "Vdetect+" and "Vdetect-" even though Vdetect is clearly indicated as a voltage source on the other side of some circuitry. This figure seems to be showing the terminals as the PI, which will develop a voltage of Vvalid when a PD is attached.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Vdetect+" and "Vdetect-" to "VPort+" and "VPort-" respectively. Also, add a differential arrow indicating where the Vvalid voltage is developing.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Text within this section reference Vdetect.

Task the editor to modify the figures and text to ensure that the original text "Vdetect" is the Vport during detection.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P59 L 32 # 24
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Annex 33A was deleted. Delete the text in additional information column in item 3 Table 33-5.

SuggestedRemedy

See above

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Assume this refers to p55, l34, Table 33-5 item 3.

Remove Annex 33A reference in item 3 of Table 33-5.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P54 L 48 # 59
Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The sentence reads with some difficulties

SuggestedRemedy

Move the references do the tables to the end of the sentence.

Replace the sentence with:

The detection voltage Vdetect shall be within the Vvalid voltage range at the PSE PI with a valid PD detection signature connected, as specified in Table 33-4 and Table 33-5

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

The detection voltage Vdetect shall be within the Vvalid voltage range at the PSE PI with a valid PD detection signature connected, as specified in Table 33-4 and Table 33-5

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P55 L 21 # 89
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 33-4, item 5 is labeled "Time between any two test points." The definition of the two test points are those points used for the dV/dI measurement that are at least 1V apart.

But this label subtly implies that the timing between any voltage measurements should be 2ms, when really we are only trying to restrict the timing of those specific test points made for the dV/dI calculation.

SuggestedRemedy

From:
 Time between any two test points
 To:
 Time between test points

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This needs to be discussed. Some detection algorithms use multiple points. Therefore, different interpretations may be used for compliance testing.

A<--- 1 -->B<--- 1 --->C
 ex/ A and C are 2 ms apart.
 A and B are less than 2 ms apart.
 All point may be used to confirm a valid Rdet.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P55 L 35 # 244
 Pavlick Rimboim Microsemi corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Vos and los are not specified anywhere

SuggestedRemedy

Specify what are Vos and los and how to measure it

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

This is a great catch! 33.2.7.1 has some info.
 We eagerly await your input ;).

A model showing Vos and los during detection should be provided.

See 41 for a possible solution.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P55 L 35 # 17
 Reshef, Tamir Microsemi Corp

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Vos and los are not well specified.
 How do you measure it at the PD?

SuggestedRemedy

See the definitions for los and Vos as illustrated in Figure 33C-17 in draft d3.0 and generate new drawing that illustrate only the location and definition of Voffset and Ioffset.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

OBE 244

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P55 L 35 # 153
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Annex 33A was removed

SuggestedRemedy

Remove reference

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

OBE 24

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.1 P55 L 35 # 41
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Were Vos and los are defined?

SuggestedRemedy

Define Vos and los in Table 33-5 items 3 and 4 per the attached drawing.
 Attached "Vos and los definitions"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 244
 Attachments not received.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P56 L 53 # 154
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The sentence "The Physical Layer Classifications are listed in Table 33-7" is not valid anymore since the equation takes precedence over the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to:
Based on the response of the PD, the minimum power level at the output of the PSE is Pclass as shown in Eq 33-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 1 # 76
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This line is a great example of the unnecessary profusion of references. Is it really necessary to point the reader to a subsection of the section he is currently reading? Especially when he will get there as soon as he finishes reading this introductory text?

Line 12 provides a forward reference for the location of PClass_PD in Table 33-18. This is an example of a GOOD reference, as it is far away and not obvious from immediate context.

SuggestedRemedy

Eliminate the unnecessary references.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 23 # 77
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

There is a significant digit problem with the values in Table 33-7. If one uses the values of RChan = RCh = 20 and VPSE = VPort min = 44, the result can have at most 1 significant digit because RCh has only one significant digit.

If, instead, one uses RChan = RCh = 12.5 and VPSE = VPort min = 50, the result still should have one sig. dig. because VPSE now only has one sig. dig.

Adding a decimal after '50' and '20' will bring the sig. dig. count up to two, which makes the 7.0W and 4.0W numbers okay. But now 15.4W still has too many significant digits.

Adding a trailing decimal (viz., 50.0 and 20.0) will get us to three sig. digits, making 15.4W okay. But now 7.0W and 4.0W need to be upgraded to 7.00W and 4.00W.

SuggestedRemedy

The Task Force should come to some agreement on how to make the significant digits throughout the standard agree. Right now they are of arbitrary precision, which cannot be justified.

Proposed Response Response Status W

802.3-2005 has 12.95W and that is still a desired number - isn't it? So we require 4 sig dig.

The main problem is this is power spec written around current.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 4 # 134
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Equation 33-1 and 33-2 use new variable named VPSE. This is actually the Vport variable for the PSE as shown in Table 33-11.

SuggestedRemedy

Change VPSE in Eq 33-1 and 33-2 with Vport and reference the variable from Table 33-11

Change Vport for the PD in section, Table 33-18 to Vport_PD. Change all references to Vport in the PD section to Vport_PD

Change Rchan in Eq 33-1 to Rch as defined in Table 33-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This equation was intended to be generic. Specific vaules are referenced in Line 14.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 44 # 234
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status X lunbal

The 'PSE Classification of PSE' seems to be an odd place to put the requirement that subclause 25.4.4.a has to be met - and due to this may be missed. The same is true for the last paragraph of subclause 33.3.5 (page 76, line 31).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest this information be moved to a new subclause of 33.4 'Additional electrical specifications'. To do this:

[1] Delete page 57, line 44.

[2] Delete page 76, line 31.

[3] Add a new subclause as follows:

33.4.X 100BASE-TX transformer droop

100BASE-TX Type 2 Endpoint PSEs and 100BASE-TX Type 2 PDs that shall meet the requirements of subclause 25.4.4a in the presence of (lunbal / 2).

Proposed Response Response Status W
see 135, OBE?

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 44 # 60
Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type T Comment Status D lunbal

I don't see the reason why this sentence is in the classification section. Maybe it is better to move it to paragraph 33.2.9.13. Moreover the symbol lunbal is incorrect, it is called lunb.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence in 33.2.8 and paste the following in 33.2.9.13:
Type 2 Endpoint PSEs shall meet the requirements of subclause 25.4.4a in the presence of (lunb / 2).

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 135

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 44 # 135
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D lunbal

This is not the right place for line mandating requirements of 25.4.4a in presence of lunbal/2.

SuggestedRemedy

Move this line to Section 33.2.9.13

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

234, 60, 78

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 44 # 78
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type ER Comment Status D lunbal

This sentence about meeting the 25.4.4a requirement seems entirely out of place.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the sentence somewhere more appropriate, such as 33.2 or one of its subclauses.

And fix the spelling mistake and add a reference to the previously unencountered lunbal. And is lunbal supposed to be lunb from Table 33-11?

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 135

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L 5 # 120
Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Pclass should be Pclass_PD as defined below in line 11.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Pclass to Pclass_PD

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L5 # 119
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This is the first appearance of Pclass and it is un-introduced.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a formal introduction of Pclass before EQ 33-1.

Add '(Pclass_PD)' after 'Physical Layer classifications' on Page 56 Line 53.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 73

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P57 L5 # 73
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This equation for calculating PClass is a bit of a non sequitur, occurring as it does without any explanation or preamble.

SuggestedRemedy

Add some introductory text:

The minimum power output by the PSE for a particular PD class is defined by Equation (33-1) and Table 33-7. PSE implementations may use VPSE=VPort min and RChan=RCh max to arrive at the values in Table 33-7. Otherwise, actual system parameters used in conjunction with Equation (33-1) may result in less over-margined PClass values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

119

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P58 L27 # 155
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Type 1 PSE is mandated to assign the PD to Class 0 if classification fails whereas Type-2 PSE is mandated to return to IDLE state

SuggestedRemedy

In order to ensure similar behavior for Type-1 and Type-2 PSE towards a non-compliant PD; a Type-1 PSE should be allowed to optionally return to IDLE state when Classification fails.

If a PSE successfully completes detection of a PD, but the PSE fails to complete classification of a PD, then a Type 1 PSE shall either return to the IDLE state or assign the PD to Class 0; the Type 2 PSE shall return to the IDLE state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P58 L30 # 74
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This note about stability is unnecessary. If the PSE oscillates, then it doesn't meet the specification. Or does this imply that oscillation can only happen during classification, and not detection and power up? Or should we add an exhaustive note mentioning all of the states in which the PSE should not oscillate?

It's a well intentioned note, but ranks up there with statements like "the PSE shall meet all applicable subclasses."

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P58 L44 # 42
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

We need to specify from when we start to measure the 6msec time delay

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change line 12 from:
 "Measurement of IClass shall be taken after 6 ms to ignore initial transients."

To:
 "Measurement of IClass shall be taken 6 ms from the application of Vclass_min to ignore initial transients."

2. The same in page 59 line 32.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

54

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P58 L44 # 54
 Feldman, Daniel Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Draft 3.1 needs to be scanned and checked to see if all timing parameters' measurement methods are clearly specified.
 For example: the measurement of of iclas shall be taken after 6ms. This is not clear enough for compliance tests.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change from:
 "Measurement of IClass shall be taken after 6 ms to ignore initial transients."
 To:
 "Measurement of IClass shall be taken 6 ms after the application of Vclass_min to ignore initial transients."

2. Scan the draft for time parameters that are not well specified for the purpose of compliance tests

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] OBE 42

[2] to vague of a remedy to expect the editor to thoroughly complete. If you have specific timing issues, please enumerate.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P58 L46 # 156
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The last sentence on the page "A Type 2 PSE that has failed to complete mutual identification may provide Class 0 power" should be linked to the sentence on line 46-47

SuggestedRemedy

Append to line 46-47

..... will treat the PD as a Type 2 PD but may provide Class 0 power until mutual identification is complete.

Remove last sentence on page 58

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P58 L49 # 157
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Type 1 PSE is mandated to assign the PD to Class 0 if Iclass > Iclass_LIM whereas Type-2 PSE is mandated to return to IDLE state

SuggestedRemedy

Change line on line 49 to:

If the measured IClass is greater than or equal to IClass_LIM min as defined in Table 33-10, a Type 1 PSE shall either return to IDLE state or classify the PD as Class 0; a type 2 PSE shall return to IDLE state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P59 L 41 # 136
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The two sentences on lines 41-42 are linked.

SuggestedRemedy

Combine to one sentence:

In this case a Type-2 PSE will treat the PD as a Type 2 PD but may provide Class 0 power until mutual identification is established.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The difference is subtle but emphasizes that mutual ID has not been completed if two fingers have not been presented to the PD. I like it.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P59 L 22 # 75
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

VMark should be properly subscripted.

SuggestedRemedy

Subscript 'Mark.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P59 L 29 # 158
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This section speaks on what Type 1 PSE needs to do under fault condition. Only Type 2 PSE is supposed to do 2 Finger Classification.

Type 1 PSE is mandated to assign the PD to Class 0 if Iclass > Iclass_LIM whereas Type-2 PSE is mandated to return to IDLE state

SuggestedRemedy

Remove reference to Type 1 PSE from this section.

Change line on line 29 to:

If the measured IClass is greater than or equal to IClass_LIM min as defined in Table 33-10, a type 2 PSE shall return to IDLE state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The Type 1 operation is describe in the 1-event section on pg58 ln49 (albiet without the "as defined in Table 33-10" that we have in this section).

Change line on Pg 59 line 29 to:

If the measured IClass is greater than or equal to IClass_LIM min as defined in Table 33-10, a type 2 PSE shall return to IDLE state.

Add "as defined in Table 33-10" after Iclass_lim on pg58 ln49.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P59 L44 # 26
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The results of the 2nd class event of a Type 2 PSE when it detects Type 1 PD may be ignored.
 This is not clear from the text.
 The text allow to skip the 2nd class event but it also permit two fingers + L2 for Type 2 PSE

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the following text:
 "If the result of the first class event is any of Classes 0, 1, 2, or 3, the PSE assumes the PD is a Type 1 PD and may omit the subsequent mark and class events and classify the PD according to the result of the first class event."

with:

"If the result of the first class event is any of Classes 0, 1, 2, or 3, the PSE assumes the PD is a Type 1 PD and may omit the subsequent mark and class events or may ignore the results of the 2nd class and mark events and classify the PD according to the result of the first class event."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Suggested remedy is overly verbose and conveys the same idea. Less text is better. "May omit the subsequent mark and class events" implies that they can be ignored.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P60 L27 # 37
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Draft D3.1

The classification voltage range should be tested for compliance under the entire classification current range.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the additional column of item 1 in Tble 33-8 the following text:

"when loaded with lclass1_min to lclass4_max"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This is not a compliance tests specification. What we should do is clearly specify the conditions under which the specification has to be met.

So the real question is: Is it not clear that the class event voltage has to be met for all class currents? Maybe I am too close to the spec but I think it is clear. Sticking with the mantra that less text is better, I am rejecting but if the TF feels that the text is needed, the added text is innocuous enough though 'loaded' probably needs word-smithed.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P60 L27 # 27
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Class event voltage should be tested for all class current ranges

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the additional Information column for item 1 Table 33-10 the following text:
 "For lclass_1 min to lclass_4 max"
 or other current range that will be decided by the group.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

duplicate of 37 from same commentor.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P61 L 16 # 198
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Also line 20
 It makes no sense to require different voltage ranges for Type 1 vs. Type 2 PSE supplies except to the extent required to maintain far end voltage at the supplied (larger) current. That design freedom should be left to the implementor. See also next comment

SuggestedRemedy

Change item 1 Vmin from "50" to "37 + (Rch + Icable)"
 Change item 2 Vmin from "50" to "37 + (Rch + Icable)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. frs

This needs to be discussed.

The remedy appears to have errors in it. I assume the proposer wants PSEs to provide a PSE voltage (lower than present values) that the PDs need, that is dependent on system parameters (cable length, cable quality, lpd, PD type).

This would be very difficult to test. I suggest the task force vote to determine if they want to give the proposer time to correct their text, or reject this because these changes may significantly complicate this specification.

----- Here is what I believe was intended -----

The proposed remedy adds a voltage to a resistance and a current. Assume the remedy should be:
 $V_{min} = 37 + R_{ch} * I_{cable}$

Here 37 is suppose to be the Vpd. The proposal would be incorrect for type 2 PDs.

Type 1 PD $V_{pd} = 37$

Type 2 PD $V_{pd} = 50 - R_{ch} * I_{cable}$

A minimum voltage could be calculated for a type 2 PD ($V_{pd} = 50 - 12.5 * 0.6 = 42.5$ V) and then the formula used could become:

$V_{min} = V_{pd_min} + R_{ch} * I_{cable}$.

This formula is only valid during average power demand. Different values would result when PD Ipeak was drawn.

Type 1 PD $V_{pd} = 44 - 0.4 * 20 = 36$ V

Type 2 PD $V_{pd} = 50 - 0.6 * 400 / 350 * 12.5 = 41.4$ V

This gets more complicated when Ipeak changes and a quadratic formula needs to be used to calculate currents.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P61 L 16 # 58
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Requiring 50 V minimum from a Type 2 PSE means that it cannot be operated from commonly available 48 V supplies. See Thompson comment #482

SuggestedRemedy

Change the following:
 Table 33-11, Item 1 Vport min PSE Type 2 to 44 volts
 Table 33-11, Item 2 min value, PSE Type 2 to 44 volts
 Table 33-18, Item 1 Vport min PSE Type 2 "50" value to "44" becoming "44-(RCh×Icable)"
 Table 33-18, Item 3 Voverload min PSE Type 2 "50" value to "44" becoming "44-(RCh×Icable×400/350)"

In addition, it makes no sense to have different voltage ranges for Type 1 vs. Type 2 PDs as each has to be able to operate with the both types of PSEs during start-up. In particular a Type 2 PSD has to operate at the low voltage of a Type 1 during start-up while establishing the Data Link Layer communication

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. frs

The same resolution to comment 482 applies.

During the May 2006 Interim, the IEEE 802.3at task force voted to adopt 50 V as the minimum Vport.
 Y: 37 N:0 A: 1
 This was done after extensive evaluation of the system tradeoffs.

Mutual identification of the PSE and PD type is possible. A Type 2 PD may provide useful functionality on a legacy system or it may indicate that it is under powered.

A type 2 PD range fits within a type 1 PD operating voltage range. Therefore, a type 1 (legacy) PD can be powered by a type 2 PSE.

A PSE normally would not change its voltage range when it provides power to different PD types.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P61 L 34 # 108
 Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Some readers may see Figure 33-14 conflicting with linrush_max of table 33-11, item-6 (0.45 A).

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove table 33-11 item-6 maximum value. This is already covered by 33.2.9.6.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P62 L 7 # 90
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 TRise units were incorrectly noted as ms when restoring this spec from 802.3af.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change 'ms' to 'us.'

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 OBE 45

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P62 L 7 # 45
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Item 15 should be usec and not msec

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to usec

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.12 P66 L 36 # 190
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The sub-clause heading is "Continuous output power"
 There is no definition or discussion of Continuous output power rather, it talks about class power and Pport

SuggestedRemedy
 Either put in a precise definition and specification for "Continuous output power" or supply text to precisely define the relationship between "Continuous output power" and the parameters dscussed here

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Suggest that the title become:
 POWER_ON mode output power

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.12 P66 L 38 # 110
 Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The Pclass in 33.6 represents the PD power demand and not the PSE power requirement.

SuggestedRemedy
 The Editor should use their discretion to meet the following remedy. Add statement to 33.6:
 The value of Pclass used in 33.2.9.12 is equal to the PD requested power added to the channel power loss.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P63 L 25 # 91
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This equation is very similar to Equation (33-1), in that it allows for variation of parameters based on actual port voltage and channel resistance.

Except it actually doesn't allow for channel resistance variation. Where Equation (33-1) uses a factor of RCh, which MAY BE RCh, this equation uses only RCh (which will be worst case).

Also, a forward reference to PPeak_PD would be useful.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace RCh with RChan, where RChan is the channel resistance, whose worst case value is RCh.

PPeak_PD is the peak power a PD may draw for its class; see Table 33-17.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Great catch!

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P63 L 36 # 46
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D inrush

The text says:

"Startup mode occurs between the PSE transition to the POWER_UP state and the lesser of Tinrush or the conclusion of PD inrush currents."

may lead to a confusion regarding the definition.

What we meant to say are:

1. Startup mode occurs between the transition to POWER_UP state and Tinrush. (Tinrush is a range between 50msec to 75msec so Tinrush is any number within this range and includes Tinrush_min as well so the "lesser of Tinrush" is redundant.
2. In addition we want to say that STARTUP MODE occurs also between the transition to POWER_UP state and conclusion of PD inrush currents.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

"Startup mode occurs betweenand the lesser of Tinrush or the conclusion of PD inrush currents."

To:

"Startup mode occurs between the PSE transition to the POWER_UP state and a) when Tinrush timer is done or b) the conclusion of PD inrush currents."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Discuss

This is related to 40 and 44. See 40 them for details.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P63 L41 # 28
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In item b: It is startup and not POWER_ON state. It should be Figure 33-14 and not 33-15

SuggestedRemedy

1. Replace item b) with:
- b) During the first 1 ms, current shall not exceed the PSE upperbound template for startup in Figure 33-14.
2. Add the following Figure 33-14 template equation below Figure 33-14:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{linrush}(t) \text{ max} = & \\ 50 & \text{ for } (0 \leq t \leq 10\text{usec}) \\ f(t) = \text{TBD} & \text{ for } (10\text{usec} < t \leq 1\text{msec}) \\ \text{linrush} & \text{ for } (1\text{msec} < t \leq 75\text{msec}) \end{aligned}$$

f(t) will be presented at the meeting

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

1. Replace item b) with:
 - b) During the first 1 ms, current shall not exceed the PSE upperbound template for startup in Figure 33-14.
- Then OBE 109.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P63 L43 # 92
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Item (c) is entirely redundant. The lead-in sentence to this itemized list, inconjunction with item (a) says:

The specification for Inrush in Table 33-11 shall be met under the following conditions: for duration of TInrush as specified in Table 33-11.

Ignoring the excessive use of "Table 33-11" references, item (c) simply reiterates the Inrush for TInrush duration.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike line item (c).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Strike c and resequence the conditions.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P64 L1 # 93
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Figure 33-14 appears without any explanation and without any apparent use.

SuggestedRemedy

- (1) Find appropriate text to give meaning to the figure; or
- (2) Strike Figure 33-14

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Task the editor to provide appropriate introductory text and use text provided in 109 in the new section

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P64 L1 # 109
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Key points and descriptions are missing from Figure 33-14.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Label Figure 33-14 time 0.

2) The Editor should describe the the curve in an appropriate place. The curve below describes the upper bound of linrush.

linrush =
50 A, 0 us <= t < 10 us
50 - (t - 10)(50 - 0.45)/(1000 - 10) A, 10 us <= t < 1000 us
0.45 A, 1000 us <= t < Tinrush
Iport, t >= Tinrush, see Figure 33-15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Related to 109.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.8 P64 L29 # 94
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This section is supposed to be explaining the use of Tovld, except Tovld has already been introduced in 33.2.9.7. Also, the 5% duty cycle concept is absent, as is the 1 second window measurement.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 33.2.9.7 and 33.2.9.8 with the following:

33.2.9.7 Overload current

If IPort, the current supplied by the PSE to the PI, exceeds ICUT for longer than Tovld, the PSE may remove power from the PI. The cumulative duration of Tovld is measured with a sliding window of 1 second width.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P65 L30 # 29
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The title of Figure 33-15 should reflect that fact that it adress POWER_ON state

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title of figure 33-15 to:

"Figure 33-15- PI operating current templates during POWER_ON state"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Change the title of figure 33-15 to:

"Figure 33-15- POWER_ON state PI operating current templates"

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P65 L37 # 55
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In response to comment #53 (802.3at D3.0) you asserted "The equation conforms to the style manual which we use for guidance."

This is not true.

The IEEE style manual (2007) clause 17.1 (Letter symbols and units) contains: "All terms shall be defined, including both quantities and units,"

In equation 33-3 the units for t are not defined. Is this seconds, minutes, hours, days, years, ...?

SuggestedRemedy

change the text "t is the duration that the PSE sources IPort" to "t is the duration that the PSE sources IPort in seconds"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs

Have our editor review the latest IEEE style manual and conform to it recommendations.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P65 L 38 # 159
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Eq 33-3
 The current for $t > T_{ovldmax}$ is shown to be I_{peak} . This is incorrect
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change this to 400/350xIcable
 Reflect the same in the figure
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P65 L 51 # 36
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Draft D3.1
 It is true that the PSE and not the PD, is responsible for limiting the current during transient lasting less than 10msec however it is important to add text to clarify that this transient is caused by PSE dv/dt .
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text from :
 "...in order to account for transients at the PI."
 With
 "...in order to account for PSE dv/dt transients at the PI."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs
 This is true but is this an improvement?

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P66 L 20 # 160
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 The reference to PD upper bound template is obsolete since we changed the nomenclature to PSE lower bound template
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change PD upper bound template to PSE lower bound template
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P66 L 20 # 61
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The PD upperbound template is no more defined. Now it is called PSE lowerbound template.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PD upperbound template" with "PSE lowerbound template"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs
 OBE 160

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P66 L 22 # 39
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Draft D3.1
 Add a drawing that explains the dependence between Voltage and current at the PSE PI during POWER_ON state.
 (Figure 33-15 covers only current vs time templates.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 See attached example "PI operating Voltage vs Current" that should be discussed in the group.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs
 The attachment was not provided to me.
 The fold-back region should be large in order to accommodate different designs.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P71 L 42 # 35
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD A&B

Draft D3.1:

The note in line 42 precludes the ability to reduce power loss over the cable and increase overall system efficiency.

Rational:

Using a Type 2 PD that requires a total of 24W (example) on a 2P can also take a total of 24W over all 4 pairs with simple PD implementation.

In this case this PD can work on 2P PSE or on 2x2P PSEs with the same PD behaviour which is transparent to the user.

In addition let's assume that in this case both pairs are coming from the same box and the same power supply. This is a classical case in which by using all pairs we effectively reduce the channel power loss and allows interoperable and reliable operation.

If cable meet the specification of 2P then cable certainly meets the same specification so preventing feeding the current all over the 4 pairs doesn't make sense.

This is implementation that is inline with the global effort for reducing power loss and in my opinion we are not authorized to preclude implementations that meet the numbers and state machines of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

"NOTE-PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard."

to:

"NOTE-PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that simultaneously may receive power from both Mode A and Mode B is out of scope of the standard"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

- 1) Comment is technically incorrect. This sentence does not preclude 24W over 4 pairs.
- 2) The rest of the comment glosses over a set of complex issues involving how the PSE would determine it was acceptable to power all four pairs.
- 3) The comment glosses over the special considerations needed in the PD to accommodate this new mode of operation.
- 4) The Task Force has specifically made it clear that 2 separate PDs per four pair cable must be accommodated.
- 5) Recommended solution does not address 2, 3, 4 and is not possible to implement in the context of a standard.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.2 P51 L 3 # 49
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There is an error in this line. Table 33-18 specify maximum power.

It looks that we allow PD to consume more than 25.5W. I am OK with it.. but I guess it was not our intention when we reduce the current from 720mA to 600mA.

So let's be consistent with other parts of the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may" to "shall"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Reference to P51 line 3 and Table 33-18 are broken. I don't see a "may" in table, and P51 line 3 is a state diagram.

Commenter needs to provide the correct references.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P74 L 1 # 161
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State D

We got rid of the state NOT_REQUESTING_POWER from figure 33-18 during the last commenting cycle. This was removed because of a comment from a member asking the TF to explain the reason for the existence of that state. We ultimately decided to get rid of that state since we could not think of the importance of that state

This state is required so that the PD waits till the power is removed after an invalid mps is presented when !mdi_power_required is asserted. If the PD is hooked to a faulty PSE that does not power down the PD, then the PD needs to wait in this state.

SuggestedRemedy

Reinstate the State NOT_REQUESTING POWER from previous draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P74 L 23 # 148
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD State D

The transition from DO_CLASS_EVENT1 to MDI_POWER1 has the condition * mdi_power_required. This is not required here since when !mdi_power_required condition is true you automatically go into NOT_MDI_POWERED state. You do not have to check mdi_power_required anywhere else in the state machine

SuggestedRemedy

Remove mdi_power_required from the transition from DO_CLASS_EVENT1 to MDI_POWER1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Original is not incorrect. Accept based on the "simpler is better" principal.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P74 L 23 # 99
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State D

The branch out the the CLASS_EVENT states to the MDI_POWER1 state currently has an "mdi_power_required" qualifier.

This is unnecessary, because if !mdi_power_required, we always go back to the NOT_MDI_POWERED state. All other states therefore imply mdi_power_required.

SuggestedRemedy

From:
power_received * mdi_power_required
To:
power_received

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See 148

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P75 L 6 # 162
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Second NOTE states the following:
"There is no minimum DO_CLASS_EVENT3 time duration, and for DO_CLASS_EVENT3 times less than Tclass, there is no requirement for a Type 2 PD to respond with a classification signature."

This is true for other class events also: DO_CLASS_EVENT1 and DO_CLASS_EVENT2

SuggestedRemedy

Make the NOTE generic enough to cover all the class events.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

NOTE-In a typical power_received event, the PI voltage will transition from the Vmark range directly through the VClass range into the power_received range.
A Type 2 PD may not respond with the appropriate classification signature to this rapid transition. In general, there is no requirement for a PD to respond with a valid classification signature for DO_CLASS_EVENT times less than Tclass.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.4 P75 L 23 # 116
Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

'The slope is the effective resistance...'
slope is non-descript; at least 'V-I slope' (removed in last draft) defined it as something.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the name of the variable 'slope' to Rslope, since it is a resistance. Also on line 33 page 75.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text line 23 & ff to:

The detection signature is a resistance calculated from two voltage/current measurements made during the detection process.

Change "slope" in equation 33-5 to Rdetect and also in line 33.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P75 L47 # 117
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

'The intent of PD classification is to provide information about the maximum power required by the PD during operation.'
 This is legacy text and this was the intent with AF. Now classification is a required part of power negotiation for Type 2 and the sentence doesn't convey all the information about the purpose of classification.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix by adding 'and to establish mutual identification between Type 2 PSEs and PDs.' to the end of the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P76 L31 # 123
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D lunbal

Sentence "Type 2 PDs shall meet the requirements of 25.4.4a in the presence of (lunbal / 2)" does not belong here

SuggestedRemedy

Mover sentence to 33.3.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

see 60, 78, 135, 234

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P76 L43 # 196
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Paragraph 3 of this clause is unconditional. That is not what we have specified elsewhere. There needs to be allowance for modification of this behavior by later action via LLDP

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to read:
 "A Type 1 PD shall return a Class 0 to 3 signature in accordance with the maximum power draw, PClass_PD, as specified by Table 33-18 except when modified by appropriate negotiation via Data Link Layer Classification."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This is the correct behavior. To ensure interoperability, it is not desired to allow a PD to negotiate to a higher power than presented via L1. This text will allow a PD to use LLDP to negotiate to some power less than Pclass_PD.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P77 L28 # 98
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The VMark_th min should correspond with the maximum detection voltage, as this threshold dictates when the PD transitions out of detection into classification for the first time.

SuggestedRemedy

Make both VMark max and VMark_th min 10.1V.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P77 L 30 # 100
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The VReset_th min and VReset max should correspond with the minimum detection voltage, as this threshold dictates when the PD transitions out of detection into the NOT_MDI_POWERED state.

Otherwise, it is possible for a PD to see a valid detection voltage, but churn through the states because of the VReset and VReset_th overlap.

SuggestedRemedy

Make both VReset max and VReset_th min 2.7V.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.6 P78 L 12 # 194
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Overall comment.

I believe that the system (i.e. PSE, cabling and PD) is over specified. Given our system configuration once you specify two fo the elements, you have defined the results for the third and additional "shalls" just get in the way and provide the potential for technical conflict.

SuggestedRemedy

A number of solutions are possible. I suggest making PSE and cabling normative and just make the PD tolerate the results. That would require changing 33.3.7, page 78, line 12 to read something like:

"The power supply of the PD shall operate within the system constraints of the specified PSE and cabling systems. Those resulting values are provided in Table 33-18 for reference."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The TF has purposely engineered margin into the specifications of the PSE and PD by rigidly specifying each end, with the added bonus of ensuring interoperability. The Table has worst case values and a PD that conforms will be ensured to interoperate.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.6 P78 L 3 # 197
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It is not clear how this "shall" is to be satisfied. Where does the identification show up externally? What is the observable behavior?

SuggestedRemedy

Define the required indication that provides the PSE identification within the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

replace the first two paragraphs of 33.3.6 with:

A Type 2 PD shall identify the PSE Type as either Type 1 or Type 2 (see Figure 33-18). The PD tracks the PSE identity with the pse_power_type variable. The default value of pse_power_type is 1. A Type 2 PD that has not completed Mutual Identification will keep the pse_power_type at the default value of 1. After a successful 2-Event Physical Layer classification or Data Link Layer classification has completed, the pse_power_type is set to 2.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.6 P78 L 5 # 101
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 "After a successful 2-Event Physical Layer classification or Data Link Layer classification has completed, the pse_power_type is set to 2."

This is ambiguous in regard to DLL.

What does it mean to "complete" a DLL classification? Is it not an ongoing process?

Or does it mean even establishing the barest communication? Well, a Type 1 PSE can implement DLL, so that is clearly wrong.

Also, neither the PD nor the DLL state diagrams do anything to adjust the pse_power_variable in after DLL has come up.

SuggestedRemedy

Some provision in the PD DLL state diagram should be made to adjust the pse_power_type if a grant for >12.95W is made.

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

Modify text of comment 197 to clear up DLL ambiguity.

TF needs to decide how to handle "Some provision in the PD DLL state diagram should be made to adjust the pse_power_type if a grant for >12.95W is made."

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 17 # 124
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Table 33-18
 Terms similar to VTran_lo and linrush are used in the PSE section also. There is a lot of cross referencing in the new std. It would only make sense not to use same names for variables.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 linrush to linrush_PD
 Vtran_lo to Vtran_lo_PD

This is consistent with Pclass_PD and Ppeak_PD

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

Vtran_lo only appears in Table 33-18. linrush appears in both tables 33-1 and 18.

Change linrush to linrush_PD in table 33-18, P80, line 36, P124 line 4.

Change Vport to Vport_PD in table 33-18, Table 33-13 P71, P73 I35, P74 figure 33-18 I3 I17 I18 I22 I28 I34 I41 I41 I10, P75 I19, P78 I23 I44 table 33-18, P79 I44 I45(2) I49, P80 I11 I16 I20 I26 I30, P81 I6 I8 I13, P83 I29 I31 I53, P123 I34 I38 I47, P124 I7 I32 I35, P133 I29 I33,

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 25 # 199
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Also, line 34

It makes no sense to have different voltage ranges for Type 1 vs. Type 2 PDs as each has to behave identically during the start-up when Data Link Layer communication is being established. Specifically a Type 2 PSD has to operate at the low voltage of a Type 1 during this phase of operation

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 33-18, item 1, eliminate the Type 2 entry and have the Vmin parameter be 37 for all PDs under all conditions.

In Table 33-18, item 2, eliminate the Type 2 entry and have the Vmin parameter be 36 for all PDs under all conditions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Table 33-18 item 1 is for static operating input voltages, and includes the rated input power. This is correct. However it is desirable that a type 2 PD start like a type 1 PD if installed in an ".af" worst-case environment. This appears to be covered by the following:

Section 33.3.2 (P72 I5) indicates that a type 2 PD must conform to type 1 power restrictions.

33.3.5.2 (P77 I15) states a T2 PD only seeing a T1 PSE should conform to T1 electricals of T33-18.

33.3.7.3 states that a T2 PD should behave like a T1 PD during/after inrush/poweron.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 36 # 163
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Class-4 is unique identifier for PDs that conform to type-2 requirements. Similar to Class 0-3 the class power in the PD section should be fixed for Class 4 PD. We do not have to do it now. We need to do it before we close the standard

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming that 600mA is not going to change,

Change Item 4 entry 4
Pclass_PD for Class 4 to 25.5W (from I_{cable} x V_{port min})

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The task force has intentionally structured all of the limits based on expressions. Since the cable current and thus maximum power is tied to the cable characteristics, it may be possible in the future to permit higher power based on lower resistance cable. At the present, the standard only recognizes CAT5 cable.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P79 L 14 # 137
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Table 33-18 item 7
1.114 x Pclass is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 1.114 x Pclass_PD

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.1 P79 L44 # 118
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

'The specification for VPort in Table 33-18 is for the input voltage range after startup, and it includes loss in the cabling plant.'
 This is legacy text and I think it is open for misinterpretation. The voltage numbers account for the loss in the cable. The losses in the cable are subtracted from the Vport_PSE numbers, is this including loss? Can we find better wording?
 My understanding was we were moving toward Vport_PSE and Vport_PD since it can be very confusing which PI voltage we are talking about. (Perhaps we just leave the PSE side Vport and change the PD side to Vport_PD to minimize the changes.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'The specification for VPort in Table 33-18 is for the input voltage range after startup, and it includes loss in the cabling plant. Startup begins upon application of VPort as defined in Table 33-18 and concludes at the end of the inrush period as defined in 33.3.7.3.'
 to:
 'The specification for VPort_PD in Table 33-18 is for the input voltage range after startup, and accounts for loss in the cabling plant. Startup begins upon application of VPort_PD as defined in Table 33-18 and concludes at the end of the inrush period as defined in 33.3.7.3.'

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.2 P80 L5 # 50
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There is error here. This is a PD specification and not PSE specification.
 1. 33.2.8 is PSE spec hence need to be deleted and replaced by Table 33-18 as in other locations when Pclass_PD is mentioned.
 2. The text discuss the maximum value of Pclass_PD max hence 33.6 is irrelevant.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
 "The maximum value of Pclass_PD is obtained as described in 33.2.8 and 33.6"
 to: "The maximum value of Pclass_PD is obtained as described in Table 33-18"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Vhange the second sentence in 33.3.7.2 to:

"The maximum value of Pclass_PD is obtained as described in Table 33-18. Type 2 PDs may dynamically adjusted their required operating power as described in 33.6."

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.2 P80 L6 # 125
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Reference to 33.2.8 is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

Fix this reference

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 50

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.2.1 P80 L9 # 121
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

this section is a mess. One, it is the 'extra information' section for Table 33-18 but it is not referred to by T33-18. Two, it is not referred to from any other place in the document (which doesn't necessarily make it bad text). Three, for this section to be correct, Vportmin and Vportmax HAVE to be Vport_PSEmin and max. But then why have it in the PD section? Four, the title is system stability test conditions, but we have no system stability test defined anywhere.
 This appears to have grown out of this sentence in AF: 'PPort = VPort × IPort, measured when the PD is fed by 44V to 57V with 20? in series.' which I'm not sure is useful anymore. I recall this was added as we wanted to ensure that PD vendors knew to put Rch in series with the PD when testing to ensure that it didn't oscillate at power up (motor-boat). two ways to fix it:
 one:delete and optionally add "while fed by VPortPSE min to VPortPSE max (as defined in Table 33-11) with RCh (as defined in Table 33-1)" to the end of the last sentence on page 79 to keep the intent.
 two:pick which way we are going (define everything at the PSE and reference that and make the equations correct or define all PD stuff at the PD and make the equations correct for that) and fix the text.

SuggestedRemedy

delete 33.2.7.1

add "when fed by VPortPSE min to VPortPSE max (as defined in Table 33-11) with RCh (as defined in Table 33-1)" to the end of the last sentence on page 79 to keep the intent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P81 L 22 # 238
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Suggest a cross-reference be added to make it clear how inrush completed is defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Chnage the text '.. after inrush has completed ..' to read 'after inrush has completed (33.3.7.3) ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P81 L 24 # 239
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The condition '.. when there are no transients at the PSE PI ..' seems an odd condition for a PD specification, does it really mean that when there are no transients applied at the PD PI.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. when there are no transients at the PSE PI ..' to read 'when there are no transients applied at the PD PI ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P81 L 45 # 236
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

It is stated that 'PPeak_PD is defined in Table 33-18.' however it is not stated that PClass_PD is also defined there.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'PPeak_PD is defined in Table 33-18.' to read 'PPeak_PD and PClass_PD are defined in Table 33-18.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P81 L 48 # 237
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

IPDUT is mentioned here, and an equation provided to derive it, however there is no definition of it that I can find, nor can I find where it is used.

SuggestedRemedy

Define and use IPDUT or delete it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If we take line 48 as the definition, then we should label the curve in Figure 33-19 as:

"PD upperbound template, IPDUT"

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P81 L 51 # 235
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There seems to be a problem with this equation, it states that IPDUT (in Amperes) is equal to PClass (in Watts) for $Tovldmin \leq t$.

SuggestedRemedy

It would seem a division by a voltage is required to yield current.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change equation 33-9 to

$P_{peak_PD} / V_{port_PDmin}$
 $P_{class_PD} / V_{port_Padmin}$

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P82 L9 # 164
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

PSE TLIM_min is hard coded to 10ms.

SuggestedRemedy

Change this to Tlim min and reference Table 33-11

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the last sentence in 33.3.7.5 tp:

During PSE transient conditions in which the voltage at the PI is undergoing dynamic change, the PSE is responsible for limiting the transient current drawn by the PD for TLIM per table 33-11.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P82 L15 # 240
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There seems to be a rather odd construct here with the shall statement that '.. PDs that do not meet the above requirements shall comply with the respective test cases in 33333.' Assuming that 33333 refers to 33.3.7.6.1 'Test cases' below, these test cases all contain should statements. So we have a shall (mandatory requirements) being applied to a set of shoulds (recommended that).

We should also be presenting these cases as specifications rather than compliance tests since this isn't a compliance test specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Decide if these should be shall or shoulds, I will assume they should be shalls. Based on this I would suggest the following reword:

33.3.7.6 PD behavior during transients at the PSE PI

A Type 1 PD with input capacitance of 180 µF or less requires no special considerations. A Type 2 PD with instantaneous power draw that does not exceed PClass_PD max and has an input capacitance of 180 µF or less requires no special considerations. Type 1 and Type 2 PDs that do not meet the above requirements shall comply with the following:

A Type 1 PD shall not exceed the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) under worst case current draw when the input voltage at it's PI, sourced through a 20 Ohm resistance (see Figure 33-20), ramps from 44 V to 57 V at a 2250 V/s slew rate with the current limited to ILIM (see equation 33-10).

A Type 2 PD shall ..

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Combine 33.3.7.6.1 into 33.3.7.6 and reword as follows. See also comment 111

33.3.7.6 PD behavior during transients at the PSE PI

A Type 1 PD with input capacitance of 180 µF or less requires no special considerations. A Type 2 PD with instantaneous power draw that does not exceed PClass_PD max and has an input capacitance of 180 µF or less requires no special considerations. Type 1 and Type 2 PDs that do not meet the above requirements shall comply with the following:

A Type 1 PD input current shall not exceed the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) after TLIM_MIN (Table 33-11, type 1 PSE) when the following input voltage is applied. A current limited voltage source is applied to the PI through a 20 Ohm resistance. The current limit meets equation 33-10 and the voltage ramps from 44 V to 57 V at a 2250 V/s.

A Type 2 PD shall meet one of the following:

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

a) The PD input current spike shall not exceed 2.5 A and shall settle below the upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) within 4 ms. During this test, the PD MDI voltage is driven from 50 V to 52.5 V at greater than 3.5 V/ μ s, Rchannel = 1.5 Ω , and the source supports a current greater than 2.5 A.

b) The PD shall not exceed the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) beyond 10ms under worst case current draw when tested as follows. The input voltage source drives the Vport_PD from 50 V to 56 V at a 2250 V/s slew rate, Rchannel = 12.5 Ω , and the voltage source limits the current to MDI ILIM per Equation (33-10).

Continue with equation 33-10 and the following text.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P82 L 15 # 111

Schindler, Fred Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

This should point to 33.3.7.6.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 33333 with 33.3.7.6.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P82 L 16 # 56

Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The reference "shall comply with the respective test cases in 33333" does not point to a valid clause number

SuggestedRemedy

change to "shall comply with the respective test cases in 33.3.7.6.1" if this is the correct clause.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 111

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P82 L 16 # 23

Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 33333? error?

SuggestedRemedy

replace with 33.3.7.6.1

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 111

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6.1 P82 L 34 # 165

Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Equation 33-10

For test cases 1 and 3 the MDI limits the current close to Ilim_min. The PD current draw will exceed the PD upper bound template for a short duration. The PD compliance should be checked only after Tlim_min

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 34 to:

"The PD current draw should not exceed the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) beyond 50ms under worst case current draw."

Change line 39 to:

"The PD current draw should not exceed 2.5 A and should settle below the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) within 4 ms."

Change line 44 to:

"The PD current draw should not exceed PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-19) beyond 10ms under worst case current draw."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 240, the section is rewritten, but the timings recommended are included.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.4 P87 L 45 # 114
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This specification ensures interoperability by specifying requirements for the MDI or PI.

The requirements for a PI are described. This automatically covers the requirements of a system with multiple PIs.

This comment elaborates on the D3.0 comment 532.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the second last sentence.
"The magnitude of the common-mode AC voltage shall not exceed 50 mV peak-to-peak measured at all other PIs."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

BUT this requires discussion

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.1.2 P93 L 42 # 30
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Equation 33-15 can be simplified and be more realistic due to the following facts:

1. The insertion loss at 100MHz is 0.4dB per equation 33-15.
2. The insertion loss at 1MHz is 0.04dB per equation 33-15.
3. As long as the frequency going down the channel margins increase rapidly (more than 20dB margin at 1MHz..) so the worst case is 0.4dB which the channel has to tolerate and not 0.04dB..!!

As a result the definition for the insertion loss can be 0.4dB max across the full frequency range.

Bottom line: 0.04dB vs >20dB margin... doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace eq 33-15 with $\{L_{conn}\}_{db}=0.4$

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

BUT this will require discussion

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.1.4 P94 L 19 # 115
Schindler, Fred Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Correct the typo, "Mispan."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Mispan" with "Midspan."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P94 L 29 # 31
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

We need to discuss what to do with the 0 mA placeholder for I_{bias}.

SuggestedRemedy

- Option 1: Delete the zero
- Option 2: Replace the 0 with 8mA

See attached presentation for the pro's and con's of the alternatives above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 113

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P94 L 29 # 113
 Schindler, Fred Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The transfer characteristic should be validated with all components of bias current present.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "(0 +Iunb/2) mA" to "(0.008 + Iunb/2)".
 Note that Amperes are used.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "(0 +Iunb/2) mA"
 to "(0.008 + Iunb/2) A".
 Iunb in T33-11, item 21 is in mA. We need to make the units match.
 Change "(0 +Iunb/2) mA"
 to "(8 + Iunb/2) mA".

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.2.1 P94 L 38 # 32
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 There is error in the text regarding the point of where is Vin(f) compare to the Figure 33-28
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "...the test signal source." and replace it with "...Vin(f)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8.2.1 P94 L 41 # 51
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 There are additional requirements that are critical to the accuracy of the measurements.
 1. The test set up must be calibrated according to the following instructions in order to exclude its effects on the TF results.
 1.1 Short RS and disconnect RL. (when measuring the TF connect RL and remove the short from RS.
 2. The Midspan may not have common ground between Vin(f) to Vout(f) therefore Vout(f) outputs must be isolated from from the vin(f). See revised Figure 33-28 attached
 SuggestedRemedy
 1. Replace Figure 33-28 with the attached revision.
 2. Add the following text after line 41 page 94:
 "Additional Information:
 1. Terminal (a) should not be shorted to terminal (c) by the test setup or other equipment common ground otherwise Midspan PSE Transfer Function may be changed.
 2. Terminal (b) should not be shorted to terminal (d) by the test setup or other equipment common ground otherwise Midspan PSE Transfer Function may be changed.
 3. The Transfer Function Analyzer Equipment is an example of how equipment common ground can interfere with the test results and an example of how to isolate between Vout(f) to Vin(f) to prevent shorting (b) to (d) by the equipment.
 4. Prior to Midspan Transfer Function measurements, the test setup must be calibrated (in order to have a total zero dB gain and zero Phase) together with the isolation device while RS is shorted and RL is disconnected. Calibration is done by shorting terminal (a) to (c) and (b) to (d). After calibration RS and RL should be used as illustrated in Figure 33-28.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1 P100 L 22 # 138
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 LLDPDU is not defined anywhere and I think this section is the right place for defining this.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please define this.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1.1 P84 L 33 # 6
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"Enable Data Link Layer Classification" (11.5) resides in the physical layer management registers. This function resides above the physical layer. For usage of this register set see 802.3 clause 22 section 22.2.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this control from the physical layer control register.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1.2 P86 L 17 # 9
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Missing second classification event status. This most likely operates as an atomic operation from detection through power up / failure.

SuggestedRemedy

Either report the first and second classification events independently or indicate when they are not equal.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1.2 P86 L 21 # 7
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"Data Link Layer Classification Supported" (12.14) resides in the physical layer management registers. This function resides above the physical layer. For usage of this register set see 802.3 clause 22 section 22.2.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this status from the physical layer control register.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1.2 P86 L 23 # 8
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"Physical Layer Classification Supported" (12.13) is redundant. Knowledge of this can be discovered through toggling the control bit (11.4).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove redundancy.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2 P100 L 30 # 126
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Fig 33-29
 The demarker between TLV header and TLV information string is in the middle of a field.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix this

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2 P103 L 38 # 104
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The PD model number does not have to be transported in every TLV.

SuggestedRemedy

This information should be part of the PD MIB.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.1 P101 L 26 # 102
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

We need to add the following text for the Sleep mode, which the task force has agreed to support in the Denver meeting. Use one of the reserved bits Bit Field [2] for the Sleep Mode and modify the contents of the Table 33-23 from line 26 onwards as follows.

SuggestedRemedy

New Text

- 3 - reserved
- 2 - Sleep Mode
 - 0 = PD is not in the sleep mode
 - 1 = PD is in the Sleep mode

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.1.2 P101 L 42 # 103
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add the following text for the Sleep mode in PD's after line 45

SuggestedRemedy

Sleep Mode

The sleep mode is defined only for the PD. The PD enters the sleep mode for power conservation purposes, in which case, the LLDP state machine in the PD may be non operational. The PD enters the sleep mode by sending the TLV with the Sleep Mode bit asserted as mentioned in the Table 33-22 .

The PD shall use the TTL timer to enter the desired sleep interval. The PD will stop sending the advertise TLVs, once in every 30sec, and will also ignore all the advertise TLV's which it receives from the PSE. If the PD wants to extend sleep interval for more than maximum TTL timer interval, it shall wake up from sleep and shall do the MIB update in the PSE, before the TTL expires and return to sleep again. The PD shall reset the Sleep Mode bit when it wants to wake up.

When the PSE recognizes that the PD is entering the sleep mode the PSE shall stop sending the advertisement TLV's to the sleeping PD and shall adjust its TTL timer value to the maximum interval. The LLDP module in the PSE should recognise any incoming TLV from the PD to recognize the wake up event.

The Sleep Mode bit in the TLV generated by the PSE is ignored by the PD.

If the PD remains in the Sleep Mode for more than TTL duration the MIB update process is incomplete and all the PSE MIB data will be lost.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.2 P102 L 20 # 127
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Lines 20-22

The second sentence is not fully correct. The PSE estimates the channel loss but channel loss is not included in the PSE allocated value.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second sentence to:
The PSE is therefore responsible for estimating and provisioning for the channel loss.

Move lines 20-22 to the end of the section. I think it would be better to discuss PD requested power details after defining it. The last paragraph in the section defines this field.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.2 P102 L 24 # 128
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Lines 24-27

There is nothing wrong here. it just gives the reader the feeling that the field means different for the PD and PSE. This used to be correct when the PSE and PD were not speaking the PD PI power value. We can do better now

SuggestedRemedy

change lines 24-27 to:
"PD requested power value" is the maximum input average power (see 33.3.7.2) the PD wants to draw. The PSE uses this value to compute the power that it allocates to the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.3 P102 L 29 # 139
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The format of this section should be similar to the previous section for consistency.

SuggestedRemedy

Start the section with:
The PSE allocated power value field shall contain the PSE's allocated power value defined in Table 33-25.
Then provide Table 33-25 and Eq 33-18

Followed by:

"PSE allocated power value" is the maximum input average power (see 33.3.7.2) the PSE expects the PD to ever draw. he PD uses this value to determine the maximum input average power that the PD can draw.

This power is always the power at the input of the PD's PI, and so does not include channel losses. The minimum power level supported at the PSE PI is the sum of "PSE allocated power value" and the estimated cable loss

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.5 P103 L 14 # 241
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Both Reduced operation PD power value field and the PD model number are static and therefore should be moved the the MIB.

SuggestedRemedy

Place Reduced operation PD power value field and the PD model number in MIB and delete from TLV.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.5 P103 L14 # 146
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Reduced operation PD power value field is something that does not change with time. It makes sense to make this as a MIB variable and not define it as a TLV field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike this section and reflect the change on the TLV format in figure 33-29
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.5 P103 L24 # 129
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 FFFF is not a word or a value.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change it to hex format : 0xFFFF
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2.6 P103 L25 # 147
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 PD model number field is something that does not change with time. It makes sense to make this as a MIB variable and not define it as a TLV field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike this section and reflect the change on the TLV format in figure 33-29
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.5 P104 L15 # 130
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 It is not clear who is sending the LLDPDU in each of the cases.
 Rewrite for clarity
 SuggestedRemedy
 Lines 15-18
 A PSE shall send an LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV within 10 seconds of Data Link Layer classification being enabled in the PSE as indicated by the variable pse_dll_enabled (33.2.4.4, 33.6.6.2).
 Lines 19-22
 A PD shall send an LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV within 5 minutes of Data Link Layer classification being enabled in the PD as indicated by the variable pd_dll_enabled (33.3.3.3, 33.6.6.2) if the pse_power_type (33.3.3.3) variable is set to 2 and the PD power draw exceeds 12.95 W.
 Line 26
 shall be sent by the PSE within 10 seconds ...
 Line 31
 shall be sent by the PD within 10 seconds
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.5 P104 L 20 # 202
Diab, Wael Broadcom

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

The current sequencing for the PD's DLL engine has a bug which would allow a Type 2 midspan to trigger the PD to send L2 packets to a switch from bootup despite the fact that there is nothing on the other side. This can be remedied as described below without losing the mutual-identification aspect and preserving the intended timing as well as the keep alive nature of the protocol.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the following text:
"and receiving an LLDP packet from the PSE"

after the following existing text:

"Link Layer classification being enabled in a PD as indicated by the variable pd_dll_enabled (33.3.3.3, 33.6.6.2)"

Proposed Response Response Status

Cl 33 SC 33.6.5 P104 L 22 # 203
Diab, Wael Broadcom

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

We have allowed Type 1 PDs to do DLL, hence the startup procedure should be defined independent of the PD Type. The current definition leaves it ambiguous for Type 1 PDs capable of L2.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike

"if the pse_power_type (33.3.3.3) variable is set to 2 and the power draw exceeds 12.95 W."

Proposed Response Response Status

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.2 P104 L 49 # 140
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

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

We are missing the definition of some constants that we use in the state diagram.
PD_INITIAL_VALUE
PSE_INITIAL_VALUE

SuggestedRemedy

Add new section in between the present Section 33.6.6.1 and 33.6.6.2 and name it constants. Refer to attachment avetteth_L2_constants.pdf for details regarding the constants.

Change PD_INITIAL_VALUE in state INITIALIZE state of PSE state diagram 33-30 from PD_INITIAL_VALUE to PSE_INITIAL_VALUE

Proposed Response Response Status

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.2 P105 L17 # 33
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Draft D3.1:

According to the text in Draft D3.1 and previous versions of it, a Type 1 PD is a PD that may consume up to 12.95W and a Type 2 PD may consume up to 25.5W. Actually a Type 1 PD that requires more then 12.95W is not compliant to the standard.

The problem is that in the state diagrams of the PSE and PD there is no mechanism to enforce this requirement.

Due to the fact that the state diagram take precedence over the text, it is important to include the following requirement in the state diagram:

"If a Type 1 PD is connected to Type 2 PSE and the PD requires more than 12.95W by using L2 or other means, the PSE will remove power from the port."

Failing to take care of the above concern will create interoperability issues when such PD connected to Midspan PSE which can not support L2. In addition, per Chad's and others rational on preventing miss behaviour, failing to include such prevention in the state diagram will encourage non compliant solutions.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace PDRRequestedPowerValue variable values from:
 "Values: 0 through 295"

To:

Values: 0 through 130 for Type 1 PD.
 0 through 295 for Type 2 PD.

Scan the draft and correct all other relevant variables that present the "Value 0 through 295" text.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.2 P105 L2 # 141
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

EchoedPSEAllocatedPowerValue is a copy of PSEAllocatedPowerValue not PDRRequestedPowerValue

SuggestedRemedy

Fix this typo

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.2 P105 L21 # 52
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Type 1 and Type 2 PDs can use L2 classification. The variable values can be 0 to 295 which is incorrect for Type 1 PD.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change from "Values: 0 through 295" to:
 Values: 0 to 130 for Type 1 PD.
 0 to 295 for Type 2 PSE.

2. Scan all similar incidents and replace with the above.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.5 P107 L22 # 226
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The variable 'remove_power' in the REMOVE POWER state should be removePower.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.6.5 P108 L 32 # 142
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Typo when copied from the baseline that was adopted in Denver
 In the PD POWER REQUEST state the SM assigns TempVar to PDRRequestedPowerValue. Actually PD_NEW_VALUE should be assigned to PDRRequestedPowerValue.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change assignment to:
 PDRRequestedPowerValue <= PD_NEW_VALUE
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.7.2 P109 L 41 # 131
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change second sentence to be consistent with previous section.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change second sentence of section 33.6.7.2 to:
 If the PD sees a change to the previously stored ReceivedPSEAllocatedPowerValue or local_system_change is asserted by the PD so as to change its power allocation,, it enters the PD POWER REVIEW state.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.7.2 P109 L 47 # 143
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 typo with MirrorPSEAllocatedPowerValue
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to MirroredPSEAllocatedPowerValue
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.7.2 P109 L 50 # 132
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 information conveyed by the second paragraph in section 33.6.7.2 is already covered by the first paragraph
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete second paragraph.
 Add a new second paragraph:
 At any time, if the conditions of a loss of communication are met (see 33.7), the PD enters the LOSS OF COMMUNICATIONS state.
 Add reference to 33.7 in a similar way to the PSE section 33.6.7.1 also
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.6.8 P110 L 5 # 144
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Section 33.6.8 is not a representative of the present L2 mechanism
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the section
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P111 L 1 # 145
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Rewrite the section to match the state diagram and to show what happens to the MIB variables. Update the definition of the MIB variables. There are a lot of inconsistencies with loss of communication.
 Also, the 5 minute time after which the PSE can revert back to Class 0 power when it does not see a LLDPDU packet from the PD should reside in section 33.6.5
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please see avetteth_loss_comms.pdf for suggested remedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P89 L 1 # 1
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "Data Link Layer classification". This is more of a remote power management function.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Data Link Layer Remote Power Management" or some other such wording to indicate what this actually does.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 16 # 5
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The PD_INITIAL_VALUE for class 4 is 295. The agreement in March was to make this 246 based on loop resistance and thermal considerations.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from 295 to 246.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 8 # 4
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The PSE_INITIAL_VALUE for class 4 is 295. The agreement in March was to make this 246 based on loop resistance and thermal considerations.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from 295 to 246.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 23 # 10
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 No exit from LOSS OF COMMUNICATIONS state. This should likely go back to the start (INITIALIZE).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reinitialize state machine in figure 33-27 when there is a loss of communication.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 46 # 12
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 WAIT FOR REMOTE may hang waiting for a remote state change.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a timer to escape this condition.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 6 # 14
 Claseman, George Micrel
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 There appears to not be a consideration for how the parent 802.1AB machine is running or whether it becomes disabled. Note that 802.1AB can independently enable the TX and RX paths.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add conditions for parent machine faults or state changes.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L7 # 2
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The state machine terminology is inconsistent in clause 33.

SuggestedRemedy

Have the state machine in figure 33-27 follow the same methods as figure 33-9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L17 # 11
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

LOSS OF COMMUNICATION should exit back to INITIALIZE where states are reset.

SuggestedRemedy

Reinitialize state machine in figure 33-27 when there is a loss of communication.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L3 # 15
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

There appears to not be a consideration for how the parent 802.1AB machine is running or whether it becomes disabled. Note that 802.1AB can independently enable the TX and RX paths.

SuggestedRemedy

Add conditions for parent machine faults or state changes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L3 # 3
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The state machine terminology is inconsistent in clause 33.

SuggestedRemedy

Have the state machine in figure 33-28 follow the same methods as figure 33-9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L41 # 13
 Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type T Comment Status X

WAIT FOR REMOTE may hang waiting for a remote state change.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a timer to escape this condition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is a comment against D3.0 that was correctly submitted but mistakenly left out of the comment DB.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.1 P112 L5 # 57
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This says "All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to IEC 60950-1:2001."
 1) why the 2001 version of IEC 60950-1 rather than the more recent 2005 version?
 2) this would be better worded as "All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to IEC 60950-1"

SuggestedRemedy

change to "All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to IEC 60950-1."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This has been carefully worded to reference a specific version of the spec containing the desired conformance tests.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.8.5 P112 L 44 # 220
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

While this subclause existed in IEEE Std 802.3af it seems odd to place it under subclause 33.8 'Environmental' - further it states that 'The resistance unbalance shall be ..', the resistance unbalance of what shall be, I assume the cabling. Finally - what value does it need to be less than - there is a parenthetical 'reference: 3 percent' but there is no indication this is the value that should be met - nor is there any indication that the unbalance needs to be more or less than this value.

As this an additional requirement on the cabling above the base cable specification (UTP per Clause 14 and ISO/IEC 11801:1995) it should be specified in the same way as we have done for loop resistance in subclause 33.1.4.1 and cable derating in subclause 33.1.4.2. Advice, which is currently absent, should also be provided as to which specification if met will provide conformance to this requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Delete subclause 33.8.5

[2] Add new subclause 33.1.4.3 which reads as follows:

33.1.4.3 Type 1 and Type 2 cabling requirements

Type 1 and Type 2 operation requires that the resistance unbalance shall be 3% or less. Resistance unbalance is a measure of the difference in resistance between the two conductors in the 100 Ohm balanced cabling system. Resistance unbalance is defined as: [move equation 33-19 to here]. This requirement is met by ISO/IEC 11801:2002 cabling.

[3] Add 33.1.4.3 to the list found in the Minimum cable type row / additional information column of Table 33-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.5 P112 L 46 # 219
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

If my comment to delete this subclause is not accepted then the references have some issues:

- [1] The reference 'IEC 11801 Edition 2' isn't the correct format and doesn't appear in the normative reference subclause 1.3.
- [2] The reference IEC 61156-1 doesn't appear in the list of normative reference found in subclause 1.3 and doesn't add anything as the equation provided is the one we are going to use regardless of the source.

SuggestedRemedy

- [1] Change 'IEC 11801 Edition 2' to read 'ISO/IEC 11801:2002'.
- [2] Change the text 'as defined in IEC 61156-1 is' to read 'is defined as:'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

If 220 is accepted this is OBE. 220 is proposed accept by the comment editor.