

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P1 L24 # 12

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type E Comment Status D

P802.3cr hasn't been published

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3cr-2020" to "IEEE STd 802.3cr-20xx"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "IEEE Std 802.3cr-2020" to "IEEE Std 802.3cr-20xx"

Cl FM SC FM P1 L24 # 1

Anslow, Pete Self

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"IEEE Std 802.3cr-2020" should be "IEEE Std 802.3cr-202x"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3cr-2020" to "IEEE Std 802.3cr-202x"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 12

Cl 00 SC 0 P10 L30 # 17

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X

802.3cb is the first amendment to 802.3, so it's not changing "IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and its amendments". Consider with other related Maguire comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete, "and its amendments,"

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 0 P11 L3 # 16

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The text, "and its amendments," is not used when describing 802.3bt, 802.3cd, and 802.3cn. Consider with other related Maguire comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Preferred resolution: Delete "and its amendments," from the clause. Alternately, you could add "and its amendments" to the 802.3bt, 802.3cd, and 802.3cn text, but I don't think a comma is supposed to go after the word "amendments".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl FM SC FM P11 L20 # 26

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

IEEE802.3ch was approved by the Standards Board.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 20xx to 2020

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 2

Cl FM SC FM P11 L20 # 2

Anslow, Pete Self

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"IEEE Std 802.3chTM-20xx" should be "IEEE Std 802.3chTM-2020" and the summary does not match the published version.

"IEEE Std 802.3caTM-20xx" should be "IEEE Std 802.3caTM-2020" and the summary does not match the published version.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3chTM-20xx" to "IEEE Std 802.3chTM-2020" and update the summary to match the published version.

Change "IEEE Std 802.3caTM-20xx" to "IEEE Std 802.3caTM-2020" and update the summary to match the published version.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 00 SC 0 P11 L21 # 18
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 802.3ch has published.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "20xx" with "2020"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 2

CI FM SC FM P11 L26 # 28
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 IEEE802.3ca was approved by the Standards Board.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 20xx to 2020
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 2

CI FM SC FM P11 L22 # 21
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 802.3ch and 802.3ca are now approved
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 20xx to 2020
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 2

CI 00 SC 0 P11 L27 # 19
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 802.3ca has published.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "20xx" with "2020"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 2

CI FM SC FM P11 L22 # 27
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Update to match the published description
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Clause 149 and Annex 149A
 To: Clause 149, Annex 149A
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 2

CI 30 SC 30.2.3 P17 L1 # 46
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Editing instruction should indicate which revision of the figure is being replaced. In this case it appears to be 'as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change editing instruction to read: "Replace Figure 30-3 as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019 to remove oPD as follows:"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 30 SC 30.12.3.1.18f P18 L7 # 29

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Editor's instruction isn't correct as the text isn't in 802.3:2018. The instruction needs to add a reference to which ammendment modified it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: Change 30.12.3.1.18f through 30.12.3.1.18g as follows:
To: Change 30.12.3.1.18f through 30.12.3.1.18g (as added by 802.3bt) as follows:

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P21 L15 # 30

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

When the editing instruction is "Insert" you don't need to underline as the editing instruction means that everything below is new.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove underlining under "Insert" editor instruction.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P21 L17 # 22

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"Power entities that implement Data Link Layer classification shall support the Power via MDI TLV DLL classification extension fields shown in Figure 79-3 after the PI has been powered"

What does it mean to "support" "after the PI has been powered"? Usually a product either supports a feature or does not.

Is it intended that the power entity that implement classification shall send the TLV including these fields? Is there any meaning to the word "after the PI has been powered"?

This text appears in similar phrasings across this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite to clarify the intent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

TFTD

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P21 L17 # 20

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Inserted text does not need to be underlined. Only changed text needs to be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove underlining or use the editing instruction "replace" instead

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 30

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P21 L28 # 23

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing period after the parentheses "Type 4 extension)"

SuggestedRemedy

Add a period

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P21 L29 # 24

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Permutation" means arrangement or rearrangement of specific elements. It is not the right word here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "permutation" to "combination".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 79 SC 79.3.8.1 P22 L5 # 31

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Editor's instruction isn't correct as the text isn't in 802.3:2018. The instruction needs to add a reference to which amendment modified it. Also remove the "." at the end. It is not necessary to include the complete table as there are no changes to the table. You could just include a single row with an elipses.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: Change the footnote to Table 79-8a as shown:
To: Change the footnote to Table 79-8a (as modified by 802.3bt) as shown:

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145 P24 L1 # 11

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Clause 145 was not in IEEE Std 802.3-2018

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Clause 145 was added by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018" at the top of the page

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145 P24 L1 # 32

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

You need a reference to how Clause 145 was added as it isn't part of 802.3-2018

SuggestedRemedy

At the top of page 24 add "Clause 145 was added by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 11

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.4 P24 L44 # 33

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

When the editing instruction is "Insert" you don't need to underline as the editing instruction means that everything below is new. Also, only part of the addition is underlined not all of it. You could use "change" but then you'd have to add additional underlining.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove underlining under "Insert" editor instruction. The same needs to be done for pse_ready_pri and pse_ready_sec on P25 L19 and L26.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.4 P24 L47 # 47

Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

"An Autoclass measurement has been completed and the state diagrams are synchronizing back to an Autoclass IDLE state." - the value of this variable is true in cases other than while synchronizing back to IDLE. (and the state name appears to be IDLE_ACS). The variable appears to be able to remain true in the IDLE_ACS state, as well as in the right hand branch of Figure 145-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "and the state diagrams are synchronizing back to an Autoclass IDLE state"

Proposed Response Response Status W

TFTD

Should this variable get set to false somewhere?

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.4 P25 L8 # 4

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The British English (two 'l's) spelling of cancelled is used in the variable definition 'pd_autoclass_cancelled' (see page 25, line 8) and description (see page 25, lines 10 and 14), yet the American English (one 'l') spelling of cancelled is used for the editing instructions 'Insert variable pd_autoclass_cancelled after ...' (see page 25, line 8) as well as in Figure 145-13 'Top level PSE state diagram', Figure 145-14 'PSE Autoclass state diagram', and pse_initial_value variable definition (see page 34, lines 3 and 8).

SuggestedRemedy

Please use one spelling of the variable.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor to search document, choose one version of canceled/cancelled to use, and replace all instances of the other.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.4 P25 L13 # 3

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Typo, duplicate full stop.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '... Autoclass..' should read '... Autoclass.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.4 P25 L19 # 48

Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Editing instruction is 'insert' but the text is underlined as though it is 'change'. Inserted text on lines 19 through 31 should not be underlined

SuggestedRemedy

remove underlining of text on lines 19 through 31

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P25 L34 # 35

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The editor's instruction is not correct as two definitions are being changed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editor's instruction to: Change definition of do_autoclass_measure and do_cxn_chk as follows:

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P25 L37 # 34

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The added text needs to be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add underline to: This function returns the following variable:
Pautoclass: is the power measured by the PSE during Physical Layer Classification as defined in 145.2.8.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P27 L8 # 49

Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The exit conditions for IDLE_ACS do not appear to be mutually exclusive. Should the exit to the right have "** ac_measurement_completed" added to it? (I'm not sure, but something is missing here...)

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest "** ac_measurement_completed" be added to the end of the exit condition from IDLE_ACS to WAIT_ACS

Proposed Response Response Status W

The overlap would be if the PD requested autoclass through DLL immediately after powerup while autoclass was being completed after physical layer class. I don't think DLL timing is fast enough to cause an issue, but maybe....

TFTD

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.7 P27 L13 # 36

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Not all new text is underlined

SuggestedRemedy

underline "*" after MirroredPDAutoclassRequest

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.7 P27 L25 # 25

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

What units are you comparing Pautoclass to? 4.0kW? 4.0mW?

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate unit to next to the 4.0

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TFTD

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P27 L30 # 50

Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe

Comment Type E Comment Status D

It is completely hidden that there is actually two entirely new states added to this diagram (MEASURE_ACS_DONE and EVAL_ACS). It looks just like the text in the states is changed - suggest that a 'replace' for the figure is more appropriate. The change marks are misleading, and the total of changes are big enough that explaining it in the editing instruction doesn't seem practical.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to "Replace Figure 145-14", and delete strikethrough and change marks

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.7 P27 L31 # 37

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

MEASURE_ACS_DONE is a new state.

SuggestedRemedy

Underline all text, including heading, in MEASURE_ACS_DONE box.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 50

Cl 145 SC 145.2.8 P28 L49 # 38

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The added text needs to be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add underline to: If Pautoclass is less than or equal to 4 W then the minimum supported output power shall be PClass per the assigned Class.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.8 P29 L1 # 13

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type E Comment Status D

double ":"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove one ":" at the end of the editing instruction

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 145 SC 145.3.3.3.5 P30 L31 # 39
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The deleted text needs to be shown in strikethrough
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "TRUE" in strikethrough before or after the added text.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.3.8.4.1 P33 L # 41
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Not all new text is underlined
 SuggestedRemedy
 Underline "max" after PPort_PD and Pport_PD-2P.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.3.3.3.5 P30 L32 # 51
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 If a 'change' text is to be used, show the old text ("TRUE") in strikeout. Otherwise, it looks like an insert for something that wasn't there before...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "TRUE" in strikeout before "long_class_event" insert in DO_CLASS_EVENT_AUTO
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 OBE by 39

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.2.2 P33 L50 # 9
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Typo.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that '... a Autoclass ...' shodul read '... an Autoclass ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.3.3.3.5 P31 L16 # 40
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The new States and text need to be shown in underline.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Underline all text, including heading, in CANCEL1_ACS, CANCEL2_ACS, and exit conditions for both states.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 Should we do a replace figure?
 TFTD

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.2.2 P34 L3 # 42
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The deleted text needs to be shown in strikethrough
 SuggestedRemedy
 Before pd_autoclass add in strikethrough "and" and also underline ", and" after pd_autoclass.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.2.5 P35 L13 # 14

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

In Figure 145-41, there is a state called "Measure" that has absolutely nothing inside of it. Because it is completely empty, it makes me think that something is missing. As far as I can tell, it is left without detail because the specification leaves this part up to the implementation. I think that the box needs some benign text inside it to indicate to the reader that something isn't missing. (similar to the "the page is intentionally left blank" statements in the published specification.)

SuggestedRemedy

Add "<null>" as the action inside the state labeled "MEASURE" in the figure.

Proposed Response Response Status W

TFTD

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.2.5 P36 L22 # 15

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

In Figure 145-41, there is a state called "RUNNING" that has absolutely nothing inside of it. Because it is completely empty, it makes me think that something is missing. As far as I can tell, it is left without detail because the specification leaves this part up to the implementation. I think that the box needs some benign text inside it to indicate to the reader that something isn't missing. (similar to the "the page is intentionally left blank" statements in the published specification.)

SuggestedRemedy

Add "<null>" as the action inside the state labeled "MEASURE" in the figure.

Proposed Response Response Status W

TFTD

Cl 00 SC 0 P37 L5 # 10

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '... a Autoclass ...' shodul read '... an Autoclass ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.3.1 P37 L9 # 43

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Not all new text is underlined

SuggestedRemedy

The "," after pd_max_power needs to be underlined as it was not in the 802.3bt text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.7.3.1 P38 L14 # 44

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Rows with just and elipses "..." need to be added everywhere there is an "unchanged row not shown".

Also, you can't add an Item with a numer already used, you need to add "a".

SuggestedRemedy

Add a row with just an elipses before PSE5, before PSE25, before PSE46, and before and after PSE52. PSE52 needs to be PSE52a if it is intended to be between PSE52 and PSE53 as currently in bt. PSE25 needs to be PSE25a if it is intended to be between PSE25 and PSE26 as currently in bt.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TFTD, this need review.

Cl 145 SC 145.7.3.2 P38 L40 # 45

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Rows with just and elipses "..." need to be added everywhere there is an "unchanged row not shown".

SuggestedRemedy

Add a row with just an elipses before PD56 and after PD57.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cv D2.0 4-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P136 L # 6

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This is a comment on IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018.

The definition of the do_update_pse_allocated_pwr_sec function includes the text 'pse_allocated_pwr_sec: See pse_allocated_pwr_sec in 145.2.5.4.'. This doesn't seem correct as pse_allocated_pwr_sec isn't defined in subclause 145.2.5.4 but is instead defined in subclause 145.2.5.6 as a variable output by the do_classification_sec function.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'See pse_allocated_pwr_sec in 145.2.5.4.' be changed to read 'See do_classification_sec function'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.2.5.6 P136 L # 5

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This is a comment on IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018.

The definition of the do_update_pse_allocated_pwr_pri function includes the text 'pse_allocated_pwr_pri: See pse_allocated_pwr_pri in 145.2.5.4.'. This doesn't seem correct as pse_allocated_pwr_pri isn't defined in subclause 145.2.5.4 but is instead defined in subclause 145.2.5.6 as a variable output by the do_classification_pri function.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'See pse_allocated_pwr_pri in 145.2.5.4.' be changed to read 'See do_classification_pri function'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.3.3 P238 L # 7

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This is a comment on IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018.

The do_pd_power_review function includes the text 'The function returns the following variables:', however, there seems to be only one variable.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '... the following variables:' should read '... the following variable:'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 145 SC 145.5.3.4.3 P244 L # 8

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This is a comment on IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018.

The do_pd_power_review_mode(X) function includes the text 'The function returns the following variables:', however, there seems to be only one variable.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '... the following variables:' should read '... the following variable:'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.