

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P 19 L 52 # 115  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Cabling  
 Reference to ISO/IEC 11801:1995.  
 In other parts of Clause 33 we refer to ISO/IEC 11801:2002 for channel parameters.  
 ISO/IEC 11801:1995 has been withdrawn by ISO.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change ISO/IEC 11801:1995 to ISO/IEC 11801:2002  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P 21 L 38 # 141  
 Jones, Chad Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Definitions  
 Maintenance Request #1273 on behalf of George Zimmerman, CME Consulting/LTC  
 Text in the existing standard is ambiguous and is inconsistent with the more precise definition in the definitions section. The imprecise language "generic term" does not point to a specific interface point necessary for the specifications attached to the PI, including a pin-out. In contrast the language in the definitions section is more precise.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change: The Power Interface (PI) is the generic term that refers to the mechanical and electrical interface between the PSE or PD and the transmission medium.  
 To: The Power Interface (PI) is the mechanical and electrical interface between the Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) or Powered Device (PD) and the transmission medium as defined in 1.4.324 (1.4.336 in P802.3bx/D2.0). In an Endpoint PSE and in a PD the Power Interface is the MDI as defined in 1.4.256 (1.4.268 in P802.3bx/D2.0)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 10 # 111  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Cabling  
 Table 33-1 lists the "Channel Pair-set maximum DC loop resistance" parameter name as "Rchan".  
 This is not correct, Rchan is the actual DC loop resistance in a system.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 What is meant is Rch. In 802.3-2012 this parameter was also called Rch.  
 Replace Rchan by Rch.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 15-1 # 116  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Cabling  
 Reference to ISO/IEC 11801:1995.  
 In other parts of Clause 33 we refer to ISO/IEC 11801:2002 for channel parameters.  
 ISO/IEC 11801:1995 has been withdrawn by ISO.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change ISO/IEC 11801:1995 to ISO/IEC 11801:2002  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 22 # 50  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Cabling  
 Note1 after able 33-1 refers to Annex 33A inaccurately. It is about channel pair to pair resistance unbalance, not about inter-pair unbalance  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace:  
 See informative annex 33A for inter-pair unbalance.  
 With:  
 See informative annex 33A for Channel pair to pair resistance unbalance.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 22 # 4  
 Maguire, Valerie Siemon  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Cabling  
 Clarify type of unbalance (i.e. resistance or current)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "inter-pair unbalance" with "inter-pair resistance unbalance"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment #50.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 23 # 12  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Cabling  
 Comment number 2 below Table 33-1.  
 The comment is correct for Type 3 and 4 but yet it is referring to Type 3 only.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "In Type 3, 60W operation, the current..... See details in section TBD"  
 To:  
 "In Type 3 and 4 operation, the current..... See details in Table 33-11 item 4a"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 22 L 23 # 113  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Cabling  
 Footnote 2 below Table 33-1  
 "In Type 3, 60W Operation, the current per pair-set might be impacted by pair to pair system resistance unbalance."  
 Better to refer to class.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "In Type 3, Class 6 Operation, the current per pair-set might be impacted by pair to pair system resistance unbalance."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment #12.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P 22 L 41 # 140  
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Cabling

Maintenance WG Ballot comment #59 on behalf of GEOFF THOMPSON, GRACASI S.A./LINEAR TECHNOLOGY

(through line 6, i.e. the first paragraph of 33.1.4.1)  
 Simplify the first paragraph by updating the reference to the 2002 version of 11801 which incorporates the additional requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

33.1.4.1 Cabling requirement  
 Operation requires Class D, or better, cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:2002. These requirements are also met by Category 5e or better cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA-568-C.2; or Category 5 cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-A.  
 The second paragraph of this clause can remain unchanged unless the referenced cabling documents already cover this material.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P 23 L 5 # 1  
 Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Cabling

Use correct draft Standards name

SuggestedRemedy

Globally replace "TSB-184A" with "TSB-184-A" (3 locations)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.01 P 24 L 29 # 59  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Types

New text in the specification uses the word can rather than the word may.  
 For example,

Can operate as 2-pair under fault conditions

"May" provides permission whereas "can" states ability.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace constructs using "can" that provide permission with "may." End notes containing these constructs with a period.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add period to end of note 1.

Replace Note 4 with: "May operate over 2 pairs under fault conditions."

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.1 P 24 L 42 # 49  
 Stencil, Len Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Types

Need to Add 2 diagrams showing Alt A and Alt B for an End PSE. Only midspan version is shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 2 Additional figures:  
 figure 33-1a 10BASE-T/100BASE-TX Endpoint PSE Alt A and Alt B  
 Figure 33-2a 1000BASE-T/10GBASE-T Endpoint PSE Alt A and Alt B  
 or  
 Add Figure 33-5 to text and make these two diagrams figures 33-5a and 33-5b.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Need to create figures...

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.3 P 31 L 1 # 117  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status D Types

"A PSE device may provide power via one of two valid four-wire connections."  
 Forbids 4P power.

SuggestedRemedy

"A PSE device may provide power via one or both of two valid four-wire connections."  
 or  
 "A PSE device may provide power via at least one of two valid four-wire connections."  
 or  
 "A PSE device may provide power via one or two valid four-wire connections."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace text with "A PSE device may provide power via one or both of two valid four-wire connections."

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P 32 L 20-2 # 118  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Detection

"A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that is capable of delivering power over both Alternative A and Alternative B simultaneously is not required to meet backoff algorithm."  
 'the' misses between meet and backoff

SuggestedRemedy

"A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that is capable of delivering power over both Alternative A and Alternative B simultaneously is not required to meet the backoff algorithm."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P 32 L 21 # 43  
 Stencel, Len Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Detection

text correction

SuggestedRemedy

Change "meet backoff algorithm" to "meet the backoff algorithm requirement".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment #118.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P 32 L 31 # 9  
 Bustos Heredia, Jairo Würth Elektronik eiSo

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Detection

If a PSE performing detection using Alternative A detects an invalid signature, it should complete a second detection in less than Tdbo min after the beginning of the first detection attempt.

SuggestedRemedy

As we are referring to a time value, it may bring the reader to confusion on whether "min" stands for "minimum" or "minutes". Actually, Tdbo has only one defined value in Table 33-11. Therefore I believe "min" is not needed. Thus, I would suggest the followin:

If a PSE performing detection using Alternative A detects an invalid signature, it should complete a second detection in less than Tdbo after the beginning of the first detection attempt.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P 37 L 37-3 # 89  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 "or a PSE that has hardware limitation."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "or a PSE that has a hardware limitation."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P 38 L 13 # 21  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE State Diagram  
 It seems that there is a Typo here:  
 The timer name is tlc\_f\_timer and then the text says in line 16: See Tlcf in Table 33-7. So we need to decide if it is tlc\_f or tlcf.  
 In addition, it is Table 33-10 and not 33-7 in lines 13, 15, 36, 40, 44.  
 In Table 33-10 it is Tlcf.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Tlcf\_timer to Tlcf.  
 Change "...in Table 33-7" to "...in Table 33-10 and verify the link is correct.  
 Correct in lines 13, 15, 36, 40, 44.  
 Scan the draft for similar for all Tlcf and Tlcf occurrences and correct accordingly.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change all occurrences of Tlcf to Tlcf. The "lcf" was meant to stand for long class finger. The state diagram uses lcf and everything should match it.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P 38 L 15 # 68  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PSE State Diagram  
 Fix Typo for TCLf  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use TCLF  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment # 21.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.1 P 44 L 25, 4 # 92  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Detection  
 Figure numbers 33-1 and 33-2 are incorrect, also references to them incorrect.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Figure 33-1 => Figure 33-11  
 Figure 33-2 => Figure 33-12  
 References to fix:  
 Lines: 10, 29 and 44/45  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.1 P 44 L 49 # 48  
 Stencel, Len Bourns, Inc.  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Detection  
 incorrect table number  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change Table 33-1 to Table 33-4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Fix all table references in the PSE Detection sections (33.2.5.1-33.2.5.5).  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.2 P 45 L 46 # 45  
 Stencel, Len Bourns, Inc.  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Detection  
 Incorrect tablenumber. link is good.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change table 33-1 to table 33-4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment # 48.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.3 P 45 L 54 # 46  
 Stencel, Len Bourns, Inc.  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Detection  
 Incorrect table number  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change table 33-2 to Table 33-5  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment # 48.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.4 P 46 L 30 # 47  
 Stencel, Len Bourns, Inc.  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Detection  
 incorrect table number  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change table 33-3 to Table 33-6  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment # 48.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 47 L 30-3 # 110  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 "Alternatively, PSE implementations may use V PSE = V Port\_PSE-2P min and R Chan = R Ch max when powering using two-pairs, or R Chan = R Ch max/2 when powering using four-pair \*\*\*systems and\*\*\* to arrive at over-margined values as shown in Table 33â€"4."  
 Issue 1: \*\*\*systems and\*\*\* should be removed.  
 Issue 2: R\_Ch max is redundant. R\_Ch is the maximum DC loop resistance of a pairset.

SuggestedRemedy  
 1: remove "and"  
 2: change Rch max to Rch  
 "Alternatively, PSE implementations may use V\_PSE = V\_Port\_PSE-2P min and R\_Ch = R\_Ch when powering using two-pairs, or R\_Ch = R\_Ch/2 when powering using four-pairs to arrive at over-margined values as shown in Table 33â€"4."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 48-49 L - # 119  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 Table 33-8 is incorrectly broken up over pages 48 and 49.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Close table on page 48.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Possibly OBE by comment # 112.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 49 L 34-3 # 81  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

"Subsequent to successful detection, all Type 2 PSEs perform classification using at least one of the following: 2-Event Physical Layer classification; 2-Event Physical Layer classification and Data Link Layer classification; or 1-Event Physical Layer classification and Data Link Layer classification."

2-Event should be Multiple-Event.

SuggestedRemedy

"Subsequent to successful detection, all Type 2 PSEs perform classification using at least one of the following: Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification; Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification and Data Link Layer classification; or 1-Event Physical Layer classification and Data Link Layer classification."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P 49 L 8 # 99  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

Table 33-8, Type 2, Physical Layer Classification column, first cell says "2-Event". Should be "Multiple-Event".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "2-Event" by "Multiple-Event".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Possible OBE by comment # 112.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P 50 L 3 # 83  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

"Polarity shall be the same as defined for V Port\_PSE-2P in 33.2.3 and timing specifications shall be as defined by T\_pdc in Table 33-7."  
 T\_pdc is not defined in Table 33-7, but in 33-10.

SuggestedRemedy

"Polarity shall be the same as defined for V Port\_PSE-2P in 33.2.3 and timing specifications shall be as defined by T\_pdc in Table 33-10."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P 50 L 5-6 # 84  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

"The PSE shall measure the resultant I Class and classify the PD based on the observed current according to Table 33-6."  
 I believe Table 33-9 is meant (please check).

SuggestedRemedy

"The PSE shall measure the resultant I Class and classify the PD based on the observed current according to Table 33-9."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P 50 L 5-6 # 85  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 "All measurements of I Class shall be taken after the minimum relevant class event timing in Table 33-7."  
 Wrong Table reference.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "All measurements of I Class shall be taken after the minimum relevant class event timing in Table 33-10."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 50 L 31 # 60  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 a TBD table (figure etc) exists please begin using a construct like TBD-# to identify the table to be used. If the table (figure etc) needs to be created use a construct like TBD-unavailable.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please consider using the above suggestion to make the text easier to review.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment # 33.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 50 L 31 # 33  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 Table 33-TBD is Table 33-9  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table 33-TBD with Table 33-9.  
 Same in line 45 and 53  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 50-51 L 1-54 # 87  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 There are 10 references to Table 33-7, all incorrect.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change every instance of Table 33-7 to Table 33-10 in 33.2.6.2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 52 L 46 # 22  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 The intention of the additional information for TME2 in Table 33-10 was meant to say that the fact that the maximum value of TME3 is not defined, doesn't mean that it can be any number, it actually limited by Tpon.  
 This may not be clear by the additional information however.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the additional information text from:  
 The time from end of detection until power-on is limited by 33.2.7.12.  
 Change the additional information text to:  
 The maximum value of TME2 is limited by the maximum allowed time from the end of detection until power-on according to 33.2.7.12.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P54 L 12 # 138  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Unbalance

Table 33-11 item 4a:  
 We need to remember that Icont-2P-unb for extended power will be higher than what what specified in Table 33-11 item 4. It will be addressed in separate work and will require a new row in Table 33-11 to define the maximum Icont-2P\_Ufor extended power.

In Extended power, Ppd at short cable will be higher than 51W (may be close to Ptype\_min) and also the same case with Type 4.

We will need separate requirements for PD that want to use extended power where the burden will be on PD to limit P2P\_lunb and Ipeak\_PD\_Peak power so total effect on current will be cost effective. This needs more work.  
 At worst case we need to set Pclass\_PD=Pclass(PSE) which I did already a few months ago and waiting to finish first the typical use cases.

We have the results for extended power with the same system unbalance parameters used for the typical use cases:

Type 3: Icont-2P=600mA, Icont-2P\_unb=Icable=773mA

Type 4: Icont-2P=865mA, Icont-2P\_unb=Icable=1087mA.

This will need to be specified to allow transformer design at worst case condition after some new spec requirement for PD in order to reduce these numbers.  
 TIA will have to tell us regarding temperature rise if total 4P total current is 2\*Icable per Table 33-1, what if total 4P current is kept but one of the pairs has the above pair with maximum Icont-2P\_unb and the other pair has the rest, if they expect an increase in temperature rise. Based on mathematical work that I did, I expect that it will not affect temperature rise over the cable.

*Suggested Remedy*

Add additional note below Table 33-11 as follows:

[Editorial note: Icont-2P and Ipeak\_2P need to be addressed for Extended power case where Pclass\_PD is very close to Pclass. It will result with higher currents on the pair with minimum resistance but will not change the total 4P current. For the above parameters in extended power, we will have to add two new rows that will specify maximum current at this case. Total PSE power will not change]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P55 L # 18  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE MPS

DC MPS current Table 33-11 item 17 and 33.2.9.1.2.

Table 33-11 item 17 do not cover Ihold range for all PSE - PD class and Type combinations in the presence of system pair to pair unbalance and/or P2P balanced conditions and for single and dual signature PDs.  
 Many of the PSE=PD combinations will not work with the current Ihold range specified for Type 1 and Type 2 PSEs.

There is a need to set two different sets of Ihold range for measuring total Ihold current over 4 pairs or over 2 pairs in order to allow different MPS detection schemes and reduce unbalance requirements on PD as much as possible.

The proposed solution in darshan\_01\_0515.pdf allows the following with a cost effective way:

- Support current Type 1,2 PDs and new Type 3 and 4 PDs.
- No requirements for MPS current unbalance for Type 1, 2, 3 class 0-8 PDs connected to PSE Type 3 and 4 PSEs.
- PSE with flexible MPS detection implementations to cover different PSE

The above proposal offers:

- Simple PD spec.
- Simple test setup.
- Simple PSE MPS detection implementation.

See DC Disconnect PSE and PD requirements baseline proposal presentation attached.

*Suggested Remedy*

See proposal and baseline text in the attached presentation darshan\_01\_0515.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This item needs to be updated. As you are presenting a proposal, I will leave it to that.

Accepting this comment results in no changes to the text.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 55 L 40 # 62  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Unbalance  
 Define variable a.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Define variable a.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Alpha is the unbalance factor between the pair sets. It should be noted somewhere.  
 OBE by comment # 30  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 55 L 41 # 30  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE Unbalance  
 The parameter "a" is not explained in Note 1.  
 To define "a" and explain it.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 a=The effect of the system end to end pair to pair resistance/current unbalance that is not specified in this standard explicitly.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P 55 L 41 # 29  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Unbalance  
 Missing full stop at the end of Note 1.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert full stop at the end of Note 1 text.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.11 P 61 L 35 # 64  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Unbalance  
 The senetence applies to Types 2,3 and 4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4 Endpoint PSEs shall meet the requirements of 25.4.5 in the presence of (lunb / 2).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.7 P 59 L 19 # 90  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Power  
 "A PSE may remove power from a pair-set of a PI if the \*the\* pair-set current..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "A PSE may remove power from a pair-set of a PI if the pair-set current..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.1 P 62 L 30-3 # 130  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE MPS  
 Reference to Table 33-1 wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table 33-1 by Table 33-12.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.1 P 63 L 1 # 82  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE MPS  
 The Table titled "PSE PI parameters for AC disconnect-detection functions" is incorrectly numbered Table 33-1.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "Table 33-1" by Table "33-12".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.2 P 63 L 2 # 34  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE MPS  
 Duplicate table 33-1 name.  
 We have Table 33-1 in page 22.  
 I believe it is 33-12 (AC disconnect parameters)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to 33-12.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.1.2 P 64 L 18 # 131  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE MPS  
 Reference to Table 33-1 wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table 33-1 by Table 33-12.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.1 P 65 L 6 # 97  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD PI  
 In Table 33-13, conductor 2, mistyped Positive V\_p  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace by "Positive V\_PD"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.2 P 65 L 32 # 65  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PD Types  
 Replace the Type 1 row, "May be" with "Allowed."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See above.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Possible OBE by comment # 109  
 make change if comment #109 is not resolved with a change to this text.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P 65 L 33 # 106  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Types

Table 33-13a, column DLL classification, Type 1 / 13W row, content = "May be".  
 Strange formulation, optional would be more apt.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "May be" with "Optional".  
 See replacement table suggestion in yseboodt\_D04\_Table\_33-13a\_v100.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Possible OBE by comment # 109

make change if comment #109 is not resolved with a change to this text.

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P 66 L 10 # 134  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification

"Type 3 and Type 4 PDs operating with a max power draw corresponding to Class 4 or greater implement both multiple-Event Physical Layer classification (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6) and advertise a class signature of 4, 5, 6, or 7."

Class 8 missing.

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 and Type 4 PDs operating with a max power draw corresponding to Class 4 or greater implement both multiple-Event Physical Layer classification (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6) and advertise a class signature of 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P 66 L 4-8 # 132  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status D PD Types

'Max power' should be 'Maximum power' (two instances)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'Max power' by 'Maximum power'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P 68 L 34 # 55  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State Diagram

pse\_power\_level value #4 in pse\_power\_level variable description should indicate the maximum power supplied by a Type4 PSE, which is Class 8.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:

4: The PSE is delivering the PD's requested power or Class 7 power, whichever is less.

With:

4: The PSE is delivering the PD's requested power or Class 8 power, whichever is less.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment #136

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P 68 L 34 # 136  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD State Diagram

"4: The PSE is delivering the PD's requested power or Class 7 power, whichever is less."

Should be Class 8.

SuggestedRemedy

"4: The PSE is delivering the PD's requested power or Class 8 power, whichever is less."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.4a P 69 L 8 # 93  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Bad reference to Table 33-7  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Table 33-7 => Table 33-10  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE by comment #56.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.4a P 69 L 8 # 53  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Function do\_class\_timing: the classification event timing requirements to evaluate PD MPS timings are not defined in Table 33-7. Actually they should be defined in Table 33-17 (but they aren't - another comment is addressing this)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text:  
 The classification event timing requirements are defined in Table 33-7  
 With:  
 The classification event timing requirements are defined in Table 33-17  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P 74 L 14 # 135  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification  
 "Since 1-Event classification is a subset of Multiple-Event classification, Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs operating with a maximum power draw corresponding to class 4, 5, 6, or 7 respond to 1-Event classification with a Class 4 signature.  
 Class 8 missing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "Since 1-Event classification is a subset of Multiple-Event classification, Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs operating with a maximum power draw corresponding to class 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 respond to 1-Event classification with a Class 4 signature."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 "Since 1-Event classification is a subset of Multiple-Event classification, Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs operating with a maximum power draw corresponding to class or higher respond to 1-Event classification with a Class 4 signature."  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.3 P 76 L 20 # 66  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 Replace " the PD to which it is connected." with  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 " the connected PD."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P77 L 29 # 23  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD Power  
 Typo.  
 Redundant 33.3.7.1 in additional information column of Table 33-18 item 1.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change from 33.3.7.133.3.7.1 to 33.3.7.1.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 15 # 24  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power  
 Table 33-18 item 4: Input average power for class 5 to 8 TBDs can now be calculated and inserted instead of TBDs.  
 See darshan\_03\_0515.pdf for details  
 The equation to be used is:  
 $P_{class\_PD} = [W] = P_{class} - 6.25 * (P_{class} / V_{pse\_min})^2$   
 $P_{class\_PD} = 39.94W$  for  $P_{class} = 45W$  (Class 5).  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 51W$  for  $P_{class} = 60W$  (Class 6).  
 $class\_PD = 51W$  for  $P_{class} = 75W$  (Class 7).

SuggestedRemedy  
 Update TBDs in item 4 Table 33-18 with:  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 39.94W$  for Class 5.  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 51W$  for Class 6.  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 51W$  for Class 7.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Correcting for typos and significant digits  
 Update TBDs in item 4 Table 33-18 with:  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 39.9W$  for Class 5.  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 51W$  for Class 6.  
 $P_{class\_PD} = 62W$  for Class 7.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 15-1 # 100  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power  
 PD Powers can now be calculated from Pclass.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Class 5: 39.9W Pclass\_pd(max)  
 Class 6: 51.0W Pclass\_pd(max)  
 Class 7: 62.0W Pclass\_pd(max) (note: rounded up by 1.6mW)  
 Class 8: 71.3W Pclass\_pd(max) (note: rounded up by 22.3mW)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment # 24.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 45-4 # 126  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power  
 Item 11, Von/Voff only listed for Type 1 and 2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add extra lines for Type 3 and 4 with TBD.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P78 L 45-4 # 125  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power  
 Items 8 and 9, Input current transient and PI capacitance are only listed for Type 1 and 2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add extra lines for Type 3 and 4 with TBD.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8 P 84 L 33 # 57  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD MPS  
 Strike "In addition," to make the sentence more concise and powerful.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See above.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8 P 84 L 40 # 124  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD MPS  
 Reference to Zac2 in Table 33-1.  
 This should be Table 33-12, but note, Table 33-12 is erroneously listed as Table 33-1.  
 See other comment on this.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change reference to Table 33-12.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8 P 92 L 15 # 2  
 Maguire, Valerie Siemon  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D AES  
 Use terminology consistent with rest of draft.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "channel unbalance currents" with "channel current unbalance"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1.2 P 96 L 33-3 # 127  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES  
 "For 10GBASE-T operation, insertion loss for \*\*Mispan\*\* PSE devices shall meet the values determined by Equation (33-19a) when measured \*\*fro\*\* the \*\*trasmit\*\* and receive pairs from 1 MHz to 500 MHz."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Mispan -> Midspan  
 fro -> from  
 trasmit -> transmit

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1.3 P 96 L 50 # 129  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES  
 Reference to Table 33-1 wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table 33-1 by Table 33-20.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1.3 P 97 L 1 # 128  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D AES  
 Table "Connector return loss" should be numbered Table 33-20.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table 33-1 by Table 33-20.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.4 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.2.1 P 99 L 23 # 52  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D AES  
 Figure 33-1.  
 The figures numbering on this page till the end of clause 33 is wrong, because it restarts from 33-1, while it should continue as 33-26.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Renumber Figure 33-1 on page 99 as 33-26; 33-2 on page 110 as 33-27; 33-3 on page 111 as 33-28.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P 104 L 24-2 # 79  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D DLL  
 "Type 2 PDs that require more than 13.0 W support Data Link Layer classification (see 33.3.5).  
 Data Link Layer classification is optional for all other devices."  
 Last sentence needs to be adjusted for Type 3 and 4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace text by:  
 "Type 2, 3 and 4 PDs that require more than 13.0 W support Data Link Layer classification (see 33.3.5).  
 Data Link Layer classification is optional for all other devices."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.6.2 P 104 L 41 # 80  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D DLL  
 "\*\*A\* Type 2, 3, and 4 PSEs shall send an LLDPDU containing..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "Type 2, 3, and 4 PSEs shall send an LLDPDU containing..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.6.3.3 P 108 L 38-4 # 133  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D DLL  
 'Max power' should be 'Maximum power' (two instances)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 'Max power' by 'Maximum power'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ