

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33 P 0 L 0 # 95
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 "Class" and "class" are used inconsistently.
 We are capitalizing Type, it would make sense to do the same with Class.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all occurrences of 'class' to 'Class'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 00 SC 0 P 6 L 15 # 266
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 missing comment editor credit
 SuggestedRemedy
 add: David Abramson, IEEE P802.3bt DTE Power Via MDI over 4-Pair Task Force
 Comment Editor
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Awww, Thanks man.
 EZ

Cl 30 SC 30.1 P 30 L 1 # 168
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 No need to have all of clause 30 here. It appears only 30.9, 30.10, 30.12.2.1 and
 30.12.3.1 relate to PoE, and only 30.12.2.1 and 30.12.3.1 are the only sections modified.
 For clarity, include 30.9 & 30.10, but really only the modified sections will be needed for
 WG ballot - 30.12.2.1 and 30.12.3.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete 30.1 through start of 30.9 (delete P30 L3 - 163 L 2)
 Delete 30.11 through 30.12.2.1.5 (delete P169 L28 - 177 L50)
 Delete 30.13 - 30. through end of clause 30 inclusion(delete P192 L7 - 194 L20)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P 196 L 1 # 169
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 Previous editing instruction (P195 L 41) has clause 33.1.1 deleted - I assume this is
 correct. However P196 L1 and P196 L12 have edits to change the text in 33.1.1 items (c)
 & (d), which are now unnecessary.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove edits and editing instructions within 33.1.1, and show all of existing 33.1.1,
 including items c & d as it is in 802.3bxD3p2 (now 802.3-2015?) in strikeout.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P 196 L 6 # 44
 Maguire, Valerie Simon
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Cabling
 Missing TIA reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change,
 "Type 3 operation requires ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D or better cabling"
 to,
 "Type 3 operation requires ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D. ANSI/TIA-568-C.2 Category 5e,
 or better cabling"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P 197 L 39 # 163
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 External cross references 1.4.324,1.4.337, 1.4.256, 1.4.269 need to be marked as External (forest green)
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 198 L 9 # 267
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Types are not introduced, they just magically appear
 SuggestedRemedy
 add a second sentence to the paragraph: "PSEs and PDs are categorized by Type." Then capitalize Type in the next sentence: "The power system is defined by the lowest Type..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P 199 L 14 # 1
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Cabling
 Missing Type 4 in:
 Type 2 and Type 3 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from:
 Type 2 and Type 3 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:
 To:
 Type 2 Type 3 and Type 4 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.0a P 200 L 49 # 59
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "1-Event Classification of differs between Types. Please refer to Table 33-10 items 11 and 12 for details."
 SuggestedRemedy
 "1-Event Classification differs between Types. Please refer to Table 33-10 items 11 and 12 for details."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by comment 186.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.0.a P 200 L 49 # 56
 Lukacs, Miklos Silicon Labs
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 There is a typo in this sentence: 1-Event Classification of differs between Types.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to: 1-Event Classification differs between Types.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.0a P 200 L 49 # 186
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Footnote 3 to Table 33-1a has a typo - remove the "of" before "differs".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the "of" before "differs" in footnote 3.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.1 P 201 L 10 # 60
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Reference to "The location of Alternative A and Alternative B Endpoint PSEs and Midspan PSEs are illustrated in Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7."
 SuggestedRemedy
 "The location of Alternative A and Alternative B Endpoint PSEs and Midspan PSEs are illustrated in Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-5a, Figure 33-5b, Figure 33-6, Figure 33-7, Figure 33-7a, and Figure 33-7b."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.3 P 209 L 20 # 137
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 "PSEs may choose the polarity choices associated with Alternative A or Alternative B listed in Table 33-2a corresponding with their Type."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Statement is too weak, 'shall' missing.
 "PSEs shall use permitted polarity configurations associated with Alternative A or Alternative B listed in Table 33-2a corresponding with their Type."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4 P 209 L 35 # 61
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall provide the behavior of the state diagrams shown in Figures (TBD)."
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall provide the behavior of the state diagrams shown in Figures 33-9a to Figure 33-9g."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4 P 209 L 36 # 249
 Dove, Daniel Dove Networking Solut
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 TBD No longer necessary
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike"(TBD)" and replace with "33-9a through 33-9g and Figure 33-10."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 We need to see if Figure 33-10 will apply to Type 3/4 or will we need to create a new one...
 Partial OBE by comment 61.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.2 P 210 L 37 # 237
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial
 In D1.0 comment 229 struckout text,
 ""both_alts_valid:A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE has detected a PD requesting power on both pair sets." This was not done for D1.1 or D1.2. The variable both_alts_valid was replaced by a do_detection state.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace text,
 "Insert new variables both_alts_valid, PD_signature and PD_4pair_candidate as follows:"
 With,
 "Insert new variables PD_4pair_candidate as follows:"
 Strike out text on lines 40 to 43,
 "both_alts_valid
 This variable is provided for Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs.
 Values:False:do_detection does not yield "valid" on both pairsets.
 True: do_detection yields "valid" on both pairsets."
 Strike Editor's Note,
 "Editor's Note: The above parameter (both_alts_valid) need to be refined by comments. These should be reviewed as connection check text is adopted."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 This should have been done already.
 EZ.

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P 211 L 40 # 96
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 original text: "... Type 3 and Tye4 PSEs shall use this value...."
 Typo in type
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall use this value."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P 215 L 9 # 140
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial
 We need additional Autoclass signature timers (eg. Tacs Tab. 33-17a) in PSE and PD state machines to distinguish short and long first finger and for measurement time.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert editors note: "Timers to be added for Autoclass"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P 218 L 7 # 20
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial
 In Draft D1.2 lcont-2P became lcont in the list at:
 "except for ICon-2P, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33-11),".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from:
 "except for ICon-2P, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33-11),"
 to:
 "except for ICon, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33-11),"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5.0a P 228 L 14 # 220
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 The section repeats a requirement. Text,
 "The connection check shall be completed before classification is performed on any pairset." is not required because the same requirement is covered in line 5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike the referenced text on line 14.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5.4 P 231 L 33 # 45
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 The word "tolerance" is referenced in the text: "but one or both of the offset tolerances are exceeded", however it has been removed from the table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "offset tolerances" to "offsets"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5.6 P 232 L 44 # 9
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

marked as YD_001_PSEP2P for Reference)

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

We agree last meeting that:

1. The Auto Class Annex will be named Annex C and not Annex 33B.
2. The Annex 33B was reserved for PSE PI P2P unbalanced requirements WHICH ARE NORMATIVE so they cannot be combined with Annex 33A.

See related comment for fixing the incorrect implementation of Annex 33B in a comment marked as YD_002_PSEP2P.

SuggestedRemedy

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

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 232 L 44 # 188
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Move paragraph to after equation 33-3.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 234 L 40 # 99
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Nitpick comment.

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 235 L 8 # 100
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

This work is completed, editors note can be removed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 236 L 15 # 57
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Match fontsize with surrounding text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.3 P 237 L 45 # 58
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may choose to implement an extension ..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may implement an extension ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.3 P 237 L 48 # 117
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial
 original text: ""
 Annex 33B is still empty, what needs to go in there ?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add editors note on text to be integrated into Annex 33B:
 "Annex 33B needs information on:
 - Explanation of the measurement method
 - Guideline for what PDs need to do for reliable measurement
 - Explain combination of L1 and LLDP Autoclass
 - Simplified margin calculation"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change 33B to 33C.
 Create/Add to Appendix 33C:
 ""Annex 33C needs information on:
 - Explanation of the measurement method
 - Guideline for what PDs need to do for reliable measurement
 - Explain combination of L1 and LLDP Autoclass
 - Simplified margin calculation"
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 34 # 207
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial
 Parameter isn't completely clear for the 2-pair case:
 "Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over both pairsets"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 "Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over all powered pairsets"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by comment 46.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 34 # 46
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Table 33-11 item 4, parameter column, states: "Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over both pairsets". In the info section, 33.2.7.4, it is referenced as the "total" current and has the information about the pairsets.
 The parameter description would be clearer and simpler if it was referred to as the "Continuous total current" instead of using "over both pairsets".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 "Continuous total output current capability in POWER_ON state."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 35 # 94
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 Bulk comment.
 Table 33-11.
 1,2,3,4 as PSE Type is not consistent, All is better.
SuggestedRemedy
 change 1,2,3,4 to All in:
 - page 240, item 4
 - page 241, item 5
 - page 242, item 13
 - page 243, item 20, 22, 23, 24
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 38 # 108
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 Item 4a Parameter is "Pairset current due to E2ERunb within E2ERunb range for class x".
 Not intuitive.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change Parameter for Item 4a to:
 "Pairset current capability in POWER_ON state, Class x"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by comment 210
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 38 # 210
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial
 Table 33-11, item 4a
 Parameter label is unwieldy:
 "Pairset current due to E2ERunb within E2ERunb range for class X"
 33.2.7.4a (now 33.2.7.4.1 - this should also be fixed) contains enough information about
 unbalance to make this clear.
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "Pairset current including unbalance for class X" (four places).
 Correct Additional Information column to point to 33.2.7.4.1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7 P 240 L 39 # 47
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Item 4a in table 33-11 shows "E2ERunb" which doesn't match "E2EP2PRunb" used
 elsewhere. The suggested remedy makes them the same.
 (Alternatively, given that it's defined, the symbol "E2EP2PRunb" could be simplified.)
SuggestedRemedy
 Change entries in item 4a, table 33-11, from:
 "E2ERunb" to "E2EP2PRunb"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by comment 210
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 242 L 32 # 110
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

'total' adds no value to this lengthy description.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 242 L 32 # 109
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 243 L 28 # 111
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 243 L 45 # 10
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is only an editor's note, but...

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

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 243 L 45 # 204
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.4.2 P 246 L 41 # 40
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

"See Annex 33A"

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

Therefore:

Aafter implementing YD_002_PSEP2P, change from Annex 33A to Annex 33B.

SuggestedRemedy

replace:
 See Annex 33A.

With:
 See Annex 33B.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.7 P 248 L 43 # 208
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.11 P 250 L 45 # 63
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"33.2.7.11 intra-pair current unbalance"
 Capitalization.

SuggestedRemedy

"33.2.7.11 Intra-pair current unbalance"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 205

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.11 P 250 L 45 # 205
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Missing capitalization: "intra-pair..."

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

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Intra-pair..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P 251 L 47 # 11
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.1 P 254 L 21 # 64
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Editors note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.1 P 254 L 21 # 222
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 64

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.2 P 254 L 27 # 142
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P 255 L 19 # 101
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 172

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P 255 L 19 # 172
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P 255 L 43 # 38
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 119.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P 255 L 47 # 119
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.2 P 256 L 7 # 102
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P 256 L 51 # 65
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

Space missing 'atleast'.

SuggestedRemedy

Add space.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P 256 L 51 # 164
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

missing space "atleast"

SuggestedRemedy

replace "atleast" with "at least"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 65.

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P 259 L 6 # 67
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P 259 L 6 # 66
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PD State Diagram

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P 263 L 43 # 165
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "The PD is classified based on power."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P 264 L 1 # 143
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

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

Wrong Table reference.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P 264 L 3 # 103
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

"The allowed PD classification configurations are shown in Table 33-15a."

This line is redundant to line 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P 265 L 6 # 144
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Classification

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal

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

Type 3 does not have class 0.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P 266 L 13 # 146
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Classification

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal

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

SuggestedRemedy

Remove row from table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.3 P 267 L 35 # 122
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification

"A PD implementing Autoclass shall not have class_sig_A of '0'."

With the removal of Class 0 for Type 3/4, this 'shall' becomes redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.3 P 267 L 40 # 71
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "After power up, a PD implementing Autoclass shall draw its maximum power draw throughout..."
 2x draw.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "After power up, a PD implementing Autoclass shall draw its highest required power throughout..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P 268 L 29 # 166
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Somehow the editing instruction for Table 33-18 has gotten disassociated from the table...
 "Change Table 33-18 as follows:"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Wrestle with frame so the editing instruction stays with the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.1 P 270 L 1 # 106
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PD Power
 Table 33-18.
 1,2,3,4 is not consistent, change to All (this is 8 times in table)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "All"
 - Item 5, Item 8, Item 9, Item 10, Item 11 (2x), Item 12, Item 13
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P 270 L 24 # 12
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power
 Table 33-18 item 7 for Type 3 and 4: The parameter name "peak operating power, class 5":
 It is true for all classes above class 5 and not just class 5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change parameter name in Table 33-18 item 7 for Type 3 and 4:
 From:
 peak operating power, class 5
 To:
 peak operating power, class 5 to 8.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P 271 L 48 # 72
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "Type3" is missing space
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Type 3"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P 272 L 8 # 6
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Typo in "value requirements are specified in 33.2.7.6..."
 It is 33.3.7.6.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 33.2.7.6 to 33.3.7.6.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P 275 L 17 # 173
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power
 "Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33-18 item 9. Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet..."
 According to Table 33-13a, there are no class 0 Type 3 PDs. (the first sentence is OK because there are class 0 Type 1 PDs)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4" to "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 1 to 4"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 150.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P 275 L 17 # 150
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Power
 Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
 "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 1 to 4 shall..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.10 P 276 L 40 # 8
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 The text:
 See Annex 33A for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.

 It should be Annex 33A.5 and not Annex A.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from:
 See Annex 33A for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.
 To:
 See Annex 33A.5 for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.10.1 P 277 L 8 # 73
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD Power
 Additional info is empty for Rpair(min) and Rpair(max).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Put "See Annex 33A.5" in both
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.8 P 278 L 18 # 74
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "of th MPS" is misspelled
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to: "of the MPS"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.4.6 P 285 L 3 # 75
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 no space between 'for' and bracket (two times)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add space. De-italicize 'for'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.4.9.1.1 P 289 L 3 # 77
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 no space between and before 'for' and bracket (two times)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add space. De-italicize 'for'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.4.6 P 285 L 11 # 175
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type T Comment Status D AES
 DM noise for 10GBASE-T under 1 MHz is still to be defined. capping it at the 1MHz level should be more than sufficient to protect the system. Further, the 100BASE-T and 1000BASE-T DM noise is only specified down to 1MHz, so to be consistent, leave the spec as written.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete editor's note.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.4.9.1.1 P 289 L 3 # 78
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Straigh brackets used, inconsistent with rest of document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change straight bracket to curly brackets and add dimension after brackets (dB).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.4.9.1.1 P 288 L 47 # 76
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES
 No dimension for NEXTconn parameter.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "is the Near End Crosstalk loss" with "is the Near End Crosstalk loss in dB"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.4.9.1.1 P 289 L 11 # 79
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES
 No dimension
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "is the Near End Crosstalk loss" with "is the Near End Crosstalk loss in dB"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1.2 P 289 L 29 # 80
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES
 Dimension is missing
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "in dB" after insertion loss
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33A P 329 L 1 # 107
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial
 Change bars missing in this appendix.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add change bars.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1.2 P 289 L 40 # 81
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES
 Dimension is missing
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "in dB" after insertion loss
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.A.4 P 329 L 27 # 83
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Four Pair is not consistent with rest of document
 SuggestedRemedy
 change Four Pair to 4-pair
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.6.3.4 P 302 L 52 # 82
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Lower border missing in "Table 33-23 Attribute to state diagram variable cross-reference"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add lower border of table
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.A.6 P 330 L 27 # 84
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Table Yuval does not exist
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct reference to table 33A-1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D1.2 4P PoE 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.A.6 P 330 L 34 # 86
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Equation 33B-1 is wrong
 SuggestedRemedy
 Equation 33A-4
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.A.10 P 334 L 13 # 91
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 missing spaces around <>
 SuggestedRemedy
 add spaces
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.A.7 P 331 L 41 # 89
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Reference to 33-B2 is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change reference to figure 33A-5.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.A.10 P 334 L 9 # 90
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 "33A.10Channel resistance" is missing space
 SuggestedRemedy
 add space
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 EZ