

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.9 P0 L0 # 43

Yseboodt, Lennart

Signify

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

See comment #8 against D1.1, which was withdrawn due to confusion about missing statements in the state diagram.

This turned out to be a Frame formatting error, which is now resolved.

The issue stands however. The requirement: "The specification for V Off in Table 33-11 shall apply to the PI voltage in the IDLE State.", does NOT only apply in the IDLE state, but in any state where physical time is spent and where the PSE is supposed to be OFF.

Those are: BACKOFF, DISABLED, ERROR_DELAY, TEST_ERROR, and IDLE.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace text by:

"The specification for V Off in Table 33-11 shall apply to the PI voltage in the BACKOFF, DISABLED, ERROR_DELAY, TEST_ERROR, and IDLE state."

Proposed Response Response Status W

TFTD due to previous comment.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P0 L0 # 42

Yseboodt, Lennart

Signify

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

(Note: page/line number absent as this section is not currently in the draft.)

The MPS issue in Clause 33 that was discussed at the last meeting is still unresolved.

See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/cq/public/mar19/yseboodt_01_0319.pdf

Also: http://www.ieee802.org/3/cq/public/mar19/abramson_01_0319.pdf

After some digging through the 802.3af presentations/comments, I have some thoughts:

- For PDs, AC MPS must be met continuously, there is no permitted duty cycle as there is for DC MPS

- For PSEs, AC MPS uses the same Tmpdo, but Tmps does not apply. There is only a requirement to remove power when AC MPS has been absent for Tmpdo. There is no equivalent "shall not remove power" requirement.

- There is no supporting evidence that the AF task force was aware of the "third MPS state". At first glance the chosen numbers (75/250 for PD) and (60/300-400 for PSE) seem compatible.

-

Without this 'third state' nonsense, the MPS spec is easy to understand: reset Tmpdo whenever MPS is present.

If Tmpdo runs out, remove power.

Because of the "Tmpdo+Tmps windo" requirement, vendors may have implemented MPS in a way where after Tmpdo runs out, power is maintained as long as a DC pulse is in progress.

But why would any PSE maintain power after 400ms without having seen a complete valid pulse ?

No compliant PD (even with a lot of margin) would produce this behavior.

The change below would not make any PSE that complies to the current spec non-compliant, with the sole exception

of a theoretical PSE that chose Tmpdo=300 and Tmps=60. Such PSE actually fails to interoperate with compliant PDs,

which is the very issue we're trying to solve here.

SuggestedRemedy

Part I - closing the hole

- Change Tmpdo min from 300ms to 320ms

- Change in 33.2.9.1.2

"The PSE shall not remove power from the port when I Port is greater than or equal to I Hold max continuously for at least T MPS every T MPS + T MPDO , as defined in Table 33-11."

to read

"The PSE shall not remove power from the port when I Port is greater than or equal to I

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Hold max continuously for at least T MPS in the T MPDO window, as defined in Table 33-11."

Part II - grandfathering (optional, I would not recommend this)

- Change Tmpdo max to ... 420ms ? or 460 ms ?

Alternatively, we can pursue Dave Abramson's approach to encode new behavior in the state diagram, where the PSE can maintain power even after Tmpdo, when a pulse is in progress. I fear however we'll end up with more complexity in the end as we try to answer more corner case questions like: if the pulse fails to complete, how fast should the PSE react then ?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
TFTD

Updated resolutions proposed on the reflector.

Cl FM **SC FM** **P1** **L 24** # **11**

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco

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

list of amendments needs to be updated in frontmatter, as 802.3cg is already in sponsor ballot.

SuggestedRemedy

Include 802.3cg and any other amendments ahead of this in the ballot process, here, and on page 10 (where amendments are listed)

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

Cl 00 **SC 0** **P1** **L 25** # **45**

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

The descriptive text paragraph on the cover page does not make provision for changes in clauses other than 33.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text
From: "...and refinements to Clause 33.
To: "...and refinements to Clause 33 and related text.

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

Cl FM **SC FM** **P9** **L 5** # **10**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

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

The Amendment title needs to be in the "box".

SuggestedRemedy

Change: Amendment title (copy from PAR)
To: Maintenance #13: Power over Ethernet over 2 pairs

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

Cl 00 **SC 0** **P9** **L 29** # **46**

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

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

The text in this line is generic template and should reflect this amendment

SuggestedRemedy

Change text
From: At the date of IEEE Std 802.3xx-20xx publication,...
To: At the date of IEEE Std 802.3cq-20xx publication,...

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

Cl 00 **SC 0** **P10** **L 30** # **47**

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

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

We now know what revision of the standard this amendment will be added to

SuggestedRemedy

Change text
From: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-201x
To: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 on this line and also on lines 36 and 44.

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

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI Front M SC Front Matter P10 L59 # 3

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Add information on the 802.3cg amendment in anticipation that it will publish first.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert, "IEEE Std 802.3cg™-201x This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and its amendments, and adds Clause 146 through Clause 148 and Annex 146A and Annex 146B. This amendment adds 10 Mb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation on a single balanced pair copper cable."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P12 L1 # 6

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This page contains edits to the "Contents" section of the base standard, but is missing the "Contents" heading.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a heading for "Contents" and place the text from this page under the heading.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P12 L29 # 7

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The table of contents entry for 33.8 has incorrect indenting, and is missing dots (...).

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the indenting such that "Ethernet" appears under "Protocol". Insert dots so that the page number (20) appears right-aligned.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P12 L30 # 27

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The Table of contents file is not formatted correctly.

The page number for the heading for 33.8 is not on the right hand side.

SuggestedRemedy

Format the TOC file as per the 802.3 template.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P12 L30 # 12

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Something is wrong with formatting for table of contents for 33.8 - page number is next to text instead of right-justified

SuggestedRemedy

Align page number in ToC

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P12 L55 # 28

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The copyright_year variable for the TOC file is set to "201x"
The copyright_year variable for the Clause 1 file is set to "201x"
The copyright_year variable for the Clause 33 file is set to "2018"
These should all be set to "2019"

SuggestedRemedy

Set the copyright_year variable in all of the files in the book to "2019"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P14 L4 # 29

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As no normative references are being added, remove 1.3

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove 1.3 from the draft

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L17 # 18

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Editing instructions without content should not be included

SuggestedRemedy
 remove Clause 1.5 and it's editing instruction.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 30

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L18 # 13

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 there are no abbreviations.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add an editor's note: "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to standards association ballot):
 New abbreviations are to be added here, and, if there are none at the entry to standards
 association ballot, Sub-clause 1.5 is to be removed from the draft."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 30

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L18 # 39

Carlson, Steven High Speed Design, Inc;Robert Bosch; Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 There are no abbreviations shown.

SuggestedRemedy
 If there are no abbreviations, remove Subclause 1.5

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 30

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L19 # 30

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As no new abbreviations are being added, remove 1.5

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove 1.5 from the draft

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P15 L11 # 1

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "Multipair balanced" is not a specific enough reference as it potentially allows other than
 100-ohm twisted-pair cables, cables that may be constructed from other than copper
 conductors, and other cables that may not be suitable for PoE deployment. Be specific
 about the number of pairs that the application uses.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "for deployment over multiple pair balanced twisted-pair cabling" with "for
 deployment over 2 pairs of balanced twisted-pair cabling having a nominal characteristic
 impedance of 100 W.". Use the ohms symbol for where "W" is indicated in this remedy.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 TFTD

should we align this with clause 145 rather than create another new description?

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P15 L14 # 14

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"for use with the MAU defined in Clause 14 and the PHYs defined in Clause 25 and Clause 40." - as amended by IEEE Std 802.3bt, clause 33 is also defined with the PHYs defined by clauses 55 and 126. (we missed the reference in first sentence of 33.1 in 802.3bt, but got the next paragraph...)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 25 and Clause 40." to "Clauses 25, 40, 55, and 126."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P15 L26 # 2

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Poor grammar makes this sentence difficult to understand.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "In an Endpoint PSE and in a PD the Power Interface is the MDI as defined in 1.4.324." with, "The Power Interface in both an Endpoint PSE and in a PD is the MDI defined in 1.4.324."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P15 L27 # 19

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type E Comment Status D

If you insist on defining mnemonics then you should use them consistently.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Power Interface" to "PI" (as defined in the previous para)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P15 L46 # 31

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The bottom right cell of Table 33-1 in the base standard contains: "See 33.1.4.1, 33.1.4.2". In D2.0, however, it contains "See 33.2, 33.1.4.2".

SuggestedRemedy

In the bottom right cell of Table 33-1 change "See 33.2, 33.1.4.2" to "See 33.1.4.1, 33.1.4.2", where 33.1.4.1 is text with character tag "External" applied.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L33 # 32

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The "PSE power control state diagram" is Figure 33-27, not Figure 33-25 (which is "Interconnect model, cross-connect model, and midspan insertion configuration")

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Figure 33-25" to "Figure 33-27"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L34 # 44

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"PSE power control state diagram" is incorrectly referenced as (Figure 33-25).

SuggestedRemedy

Change from: Figure 33-25, To: Figure 33-27.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 32

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L34 # 20

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Tables do not "update" anything, they may describe how something is updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "updated by Table 33-6" to "updated per Table 33-6"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L34 # 21

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

I do not see how the variable pd_dll_power_type can be updated by (or more properly per) Table 33-6—Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics which appears to be unrelated to the variable.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps this should be Table 33-23? Or perhaps a better explanation of the mechanism of this update is needed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 40

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L34 # 33

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

This says "and updated by Table 33-6" but Table 33-6 is "Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics". This does not seem to be the correct table. It seems more likely that this should be Table 33-23 "Attribute to state diagram variable cross-reference"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 33-6" to "Table 33-23"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 40

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L35 # 40

Carlson, Steven High Speed Design, Inc;Robert Bosch; Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This statement, "updated by Table 33-6 that indicates the type of PD as advertised through Data Link Layer" makes no sense. Table 33-6—Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics, has nothing to do with the DDL classification. Is Table 33-7—Physical Layer power classifications (PClass) what is meant? That doesn't really make sense to me, either. I see no table that refers to updating the physical layer class. The same language is also used on page 17, line 41.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the reference to Table 33-6 to whatever the correct table is and language that indicates the function and correct table that does the updating. This should also be done for page 17, line 41.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L35 # 15

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"updated by Table 33-6" Tables don't update, and I can't figure out what is meant because Table 33-6 is the Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics. (do you mean Table 33-7, the Physical layer classifications? Not sure) - honestly, I don't see a table that really applies to updating the dll classification... Same comment applies to page 17 L41 which has the same text

SuggestedRemedy

Replace reference to Table 33-6 with appropriate reference (whatever that may be), and change "updated by" with "updated by <whatever the intended function is> according to Table 33-xx" Same comment applies to P17 L41, which has the same text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 40

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L38 # 34

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The format of this paragraph is different from that in Clause 33.
 The Indent, Left should be 38 pt so that the "PD" elements align.
 Same issue in 33.3.3.3

SuggestedRemedy

Click in the paragraph, Paragraph designer pod, change the "Indent", "Left" to 38 pt,
 Update Style, Retain Overrides

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P16 L38 # 8

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The indent on value 2 is misaligned.

SuggestedRemedy

Indent the 2 so that it underneath the 1 value. After the "2:" remove the tab.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7 P17 L1 # 4

Abramson, David Texas Instruments
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

MPS requirements disagree with the state diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

See abramson_01_0519.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W
 TFTD

See other MPS comment

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P17 L39 # 35

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The "PD power control state diagram" is Figure 33-28, not Figure 33-26 (which is
 "Measurement setup for Alternative A Midspan PSE transfer function")

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Figure 33-26" to "Figure 33-28"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P17 L39 # 23

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

I do not see how the variable pse_dll_power_type can be updated by Table 33-6—Invalid
 PD detection signature electrical characteristics which appears to be unrelated to the
 variable.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps this should be Table 33-23? Or perhaps a better explanation of the mechanism of
 this update is needed.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 40

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P17 L39 # 22

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Tables do not "update" anything, they may describe how something is updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "updated by Table 33-6" to "updated per Table 33-6"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P17 L40 # 36

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

This says "and updated by Table 33-6" but Table 33-6 is "Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics". This does not seem to be the correct table. It seems more likely that this should be Table 33-23 "Attribute to state diagram variable cross-reference"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Table 33-6" to "Table 33-23"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 40

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P17 L43 # 9

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The indent on value 2 is misaligned.

SuggestedRemedy
 Indent the 2 so that it underneath the 1 value. After the "2:" remove the tab.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P18 L11 # 24

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Figure 33-16 the exit criteria from the IDLE state does not need parenthesis.

SuggestedRemedy
 change "(VPD > VReset)" to "VPD > VReset" using proper subscripting.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P18 L22 # 17

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

After state: "DO_CLASS_EVENT1" the following text is in two different fonts and sizes it seems: "(VPD < VMark_th) *pd_2-event" or the lack of vertical separation makes it appear that way.

SuggestedRemedy
 Check the font size and correct as needed and add additional vertical spacing between the two lines.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L8 # 16

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 33-6 is the wrong table and there is no parameter Von_pd in that table or any other. It appears to be Table 33-18 which is meant, and it appears that the parameter is V_on, not V_on_PD.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Table 33-6" to "Table 33-18", and V_On_PD to V_On.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L8 # 26

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Tdelay is not defined or used in Clause 33 nor are the following variables: Cport, Inrush_PD

At least I was unable to find them with a pdf search in this amendment (or the base Std)

SuggestedRemedy
 I see them in Table 33-18 but for some reason they are not searchable. It would be of benefit to the reader if they were searchable, please make them searchable.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TFTD...Lennart?

IEEE P802.3cq D2.0 2-Pair PoE Maintenance Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L8 # 37

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

This says "VOn_PD as defined in Table 33-6," but Table 33-6 is "Invalid PD detection signature electrical characteristics" and VOn_PD is not defined there.
 There is no occurrence of "VOn_PD" in Clause 33 of the base standard. There is a "PD Power supply turn on voltage" in Table 33-18 but this is VOn not VOn_PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
 Change "VOn_PD as defined in Table 33-6," to "VOn as defined in Table 33-18,"
 or:
 Make some other change that corrects this sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 16

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L8 # 41

Carlson, Steven High Speed Design, Inc;Robert Bosch; Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 33-6 is not the correct table. VOn_PD does not exist in the draft. Table 33-18—PD power supply limits is the correct table, and the parameter is Von.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 33-6 to Table 33-18 and VOn_PD to Von..

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 16

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L8 # 25

Remein, Duane Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

VOn_PD is not defined in Table 33-6

SuggestedRemedy

Near as I can tell this variable is not defined in Cl 33 at all but in 145 (see IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018 pg 185 section 145.3.3.3.2)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 16

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P19 L14 # 38

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

The convention used in 802.3 is to not have a space between the number and %

SuggestedRemedy

Change "99 %" to "99%"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.5 P20 L0 # 5

Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D

As discussed at the March 2019 meeting in Vancouver (and as written in the minutes from that meeting so that we don't forget), we need to deprecate section 33.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the note to the top of section 33.5:
 Note - 33.5 has been deprecated. Since May 2019, maintenance changes are no longer being considered for this subclause.
 Also, delete the following PICS:
 33.8.2.4 *MAN, *PCA
 33.8.3.7 the whole subclause

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.