

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 01 SC 1.4 P 2 L 14 # 67
Thaler, Pat Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A

There are two problems with the changes to the MDI definition:
Clause 12 (1 Mb/s) does not use the term MAU. It only uses PMA. Since we are balloting a change which will add a statement that we are no longer maintain clause to the beginning of each deprecated clause and since 1BASE5 is very obsolete, the definition can ignore 1 Mb/s as the previous definition did. Delete 1 Mb/s. Basing the definition on speed may also be short lived as I expect that the lower speed PHYs added by EFM will also be called PHYs. I suggest fixing this by putting only an example in the parenthesis).
Grammatically, when one 'between A and B and also C' it isn't clear whether you mean that there is a connection between A and C only or also between B and C. The original sentence structure was better.

SuggestedRemedy

The mechanical and electrical interface between the transmission medium and the MAU (e.g. 10BASE-T) or the PHY (e.g. 1000BASE-T) and also between the transmission medium and any associated (optional per 802.3 clause 33) Powered Device (PD) or endpoint Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE).

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The mechanical and electrical or optical interface between the transmission medium and the MAU (e.g. 10BASE-T) or the PHY (e.g. 1000BASE-T) and also between the transmission medium and any associated (optional per 802.3 clause 33) Powered Device (PD) or endpoint Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE).

The problem with this is that this definition is not correct for 802.3ae where the MDI is defined to be one meter out on the fiber.

This may be an 802.3ae maintenance issue.

CI 00 SC 14.10.4.5.11 P 4 L 32 # 77
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Change the text '... to all external circuits' to read '... to all external conductors' to match the text in 14.3.1.1 (line 8) that the PICS references.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 22 SC Table 22-6 P 6 L 43 # 52
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The register name 'PSE/PD Status register' is incorrect as this address now only contains PSE Status Register bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'PSE/PD Status register' to 'PSE Status register'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Instruct editor to search Clause 22 for 'PSE/PD status register' and replace with 'PSE status register' where appropriate

CI 33 SC 33.1 P 7 L 1 # 98
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status A

AMANDMENT" is miss-spelled

SuggestedRemedy

"AMANDMENT" NEEDS TO BE CHANGED TO "AMENDMENT"

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See Law 88 - same comment

CI 22 SC 22.2.4.3.10 P 7 L 17 # 53
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The subclause title 'PSE/PD Status register (Register 12)' is incorrect as this register now only contains PSE Status Register bits. The subclause text is also incorrect for the same reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'PSE/PD Status register (Register 12)' to read 'PSE Status register (Register 12)'. Also need to change the text 'Register 12 provides status bits that are supplied by a PSE and PD.' to read 'Register 12 provides status bits that are supplied by a PSE.'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 00 SC 40.6.1.1 P 12 L 8 # 6
Karam, Roger Cisco systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D

confusion about what a 'phy' is per IEEE lingo, we show the phy as a phy on fig 33-4, on fig 33-3 we put a box for the PD or PSE next to a 'phy' and here we are ordering the PMA changed, to say that a phy that has a 'PD' - first we need to agree on how the 'phy' (as i know it at least) would affect our changes, then put a fix in.
Do we mean MAU when we say 'phy'?

SuggestedRemedy

we need to agree on the definitions here, so fig 33-3, fig 33-4 and the 10/100/1000 spec tell a consistent story. as usual i would volunteer a fix here, but i am not sure what the original intent was and we need consensus.
My Remedy goes farther:
I think this should be called a PI.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

Withdrawn

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Deferred to Law 76

CI 00 SC 40.6.1.1 P 12 L 9 # 79
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

In the existing mention of frame ground within this subclause the condition (if any) is included. Similar text isn't included in the new, now first instance, of the term Frame Ground.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that text '... including frame ground and all ...' should be changed to read '... including frame ground (if any) and all ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 40.12.2 P 12 L 19 # 80
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

PICS typo. An option that is used to predicate items is usually preceded with a '*'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'PD' to read '*PD'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 40.12.7 P 12 L 28 # 78
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

PICS typo. Where a item has a predicate the Support column should contain both 'N/A[] and Yes[]'.

SuggestedRemedy

In both items PME15a and PME15b change the text 'Yes[]' to read 'N/A[] and Yes[]'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 30.9.5.1.2 P 19 L 35 # 81
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Typo and incorrect cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... PSE Enable bit specified in 33.6.1.1.5.;' to read '... PSE Enable bits specified in 33.6.1.1.3.;'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 33.9.5.1.3 P 19 L 48 # 83
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Incorrect cross-reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... in 33.6.1.2.6;' to read '... in 33.6.1.2.10.;'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33 P 35 L 0 # 88
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

I'm sure lots of folk have pointed this out but the running header mis-spells Amendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'Draft Amandment' to read 'Draft Amendment'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.1 P 35 L 37 # 89
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Possible typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'Powered Devices designed to the standard and within its range of available power can ...' to read 'Powered Devices designed to the standard, and within its range of available power, can ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC Figure 33-1 P 36 L 9 # 54
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Please centre the text 'MDI/PI' within the box it is contained. Currently it seems to be right justified. Please perform the same fix to Figure 33-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Centre the text 'MDI/PI' within the box it is contained in Figures 33-1 and 33-2.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Centered.

Dave Law to supply Frame drawing to replace 33-5.

CI 33 SC Figure 33-1 P 36 L 10 # 90
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Suggest that text 'MDI/PI' should be centered in figures 33-1 and 33-2.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See Law #54 - same comment

CI 33 SC 33.1.2 P 37 L 1 # 66
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The statement 'Any device which contains an MDI compliant with Clause 14, Clause 25 and/or Clause 40, and sinks and/or sources power in accordance with the specifications c this clause is permitted.' implies that a device can simultaneously be a PD and a PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to: 'Any device which contains an MDI compliant with Clause 14, Clause 25 and/or Clause 40, and sinks or sources power in accordance with the specifications of this clause is permitted.'

Proposed Response Response Status Z

Withdrawn

Scope?

CI 33 SC 33.2.1 P 37 L 27 # 31
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status R

We have change the wording from link segmet to link section.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Both instances are correct. No change required.

Link segment goes MDI to MDI. A link section is a piece of a link segment.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 33 SC 2.1 P 38 L 1 # 8
Karam, Roger Cisco systems

Comment Type E Comment Status A

figure 33-4
missing a few clarifications/details.

SuggestedRemedy

please add :
- the polarity of power,
- pin numbers of RJ45,
- a box called termination to represent the termination concept.
please append the word legacy to the bottom circuit diagram where the word switch/hub is (on the left). i will be glad to hand a marked up figure, if needed.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

That was all left out on purpose. These are intended to be examples, not something that a reader would follow as an implementation.

Change Midspan PSE from 'Switch/Hub' to 'Non-PSE Switch/Hub'

CI 33 SC Figure 33-4 P 38 L 38 # 30
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Bottom figure has extra lines on switch xfmr (as copied from top fig)

SuggestedRemedy

Match to middle fig instead.
(We should be able to do this as a post balloting change, if not leave it)

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC Figure 33-6 P 44 L 3 # 59
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

There is an inconsistent use of brackets in the equations in this state machine. In the transition into IDLE the equation reads 'pse_reset + error_condition * (mr_pse_enable = enable)' where as the transition into TEST_MODE reads 'mr_pse_enable = force_power * !error_condition'

Editorial note: There're called brackets where I come from however I think they are called braces in the US.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that in all cases where a variable comparison takes place brackets should be used

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC Table 33-2 P 47 L 17 # 61
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Isn't the reference to 33.2.6.2 and 33.2.6.1 in items 8, 9 and 12 circular references since these subclauses reference the parameters defined in these items.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the above references in the Addition Information column be deleted.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove references to sections in 'additional information' column. 4 places.

CI 33 SC table 33-2 P 47 L 20 # 40
Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type E Comment Status A

There is an error in table 33-2.
The value in item 9 should be 130nf and not 120nf.
120nf should be the value in table 33-8.

SuggestedRemedy

Page 47 line 9: change from 120nf to 130nf
Page 60 line 19: change from 130nf to 120nf.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See Karam 21, this changes Page 47 line 9 to 150nF, instead of 130nF.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P 48 L 12 # 101
Darshan, Yair

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Based on field reports, the TF determined that some implementers have used termination topology appropriate for a non-powered port.

SuggestedRemedy

Add cautionary note:

In a multiport system, the implementer should maintain DC isolation through the terminations to eliminate cross-port leakage currents.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.5 P 52 L 11 # 45
Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type E Comment Status A

During startup, the PSE has to meet Inrush for Tlim as indicated in the state flow however it is not clear at the text in paragraph 33.2.8.5 at part c)

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 11 at part c) from:

'During startup,the PSE shall meet the minimum I Inrush requirement at all PI voltages above 30V.'

to

'During startup,the PSE shall meet the minimum IInrush requirement for Tlim duration, at all PI voltages above 30V.'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

'During startup,the PSE shall meet the minimum IInrush requirement for duration Tlim, at all PI voltages above 30V.'

CI 33 SC 2.8.6 P 52 L 24 # 13
Karam, Roger Cisco systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

item f)

the PI proceeds to enter the off state when vport has dropped by 1v due to the initiated power /...

this item seems like a way to test the time, if yes we need to clarify the way we have it now, as item f) would look like a 'definition' of what the time is in relation to the non-acceptable vport spec per af 44-57v with 44v being min.

SuggestedRemedy

define the start to be the point where the supply crosses 44v the min acceptable vport.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

Withdrawn

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P 53 L 43 # 93
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status A

This subclauyse states that 'Allocating power based on additional information about the attached PD, and the mechanism for obtaining that additional information, is beyond the scope of this standard.' yet then makes a statement that 'Allocating power shall not be based solely on the historical data of the power consumption of the attached PD.' which means we do consider one item as being within the scope of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that text:

'Allocating power based on additional information about the attached PD, and the mechanism for obtaining that additional information, is beyond the scope of this standard.

Allocating power shall not be based solely on the historical data of the power consumption of the attached PD.'

should be change to read:

'Allocating power based on additional information about the attached PD, and the mechanism for obtaining that additional information, is beyond the scope of this standard with the exception that the allocation of power shall not be based solely on the historical data of the power consumption of the attached PD.'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 33 SC 2.10 P 54 L 3 # 14
Karam, Roger Cisco systems
Comment Type E Comment Status A
maintain the power signature,
but we do not call it what it becomes in the rest of the draft
MPS
SuggestedRemedy
add this text:
maintain power signature, referred to as MPS in the rest of this document.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Maintain Power Signature (MPS).

CI 33 SC 33.3.1 P 57 L 21 # 100
Jones, Chad
Comment Type E Comment Status A
During comment resolution the TF noticed that this note actually occurs in the text before
the shall statement.
Note: PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this
standard. PDs that
simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not allowed by
this standard.
SuggestedRemedy
Move the note underneath the paragraph on Page 57 Line 46, so that the informative text
follows after the normative text.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.6 P 64 L 19 # 95
Law, David 3Com
Comment Type E Comment Status A
The text states '.. the minimum current draw as specified in Table 33-13 for a minimum of
75ms ...' however Table 33-13 only provides a Input current value, not a minimum current
draw value. While it is fairly obvious to see that these are the same values for the sake a
clarity suggest the reference be tightened up.
SuggestedRemedy
Suggest the text '... the minimum current draw as specified in Table 33-13 for a minimum
of 75ms ...' should be changed to read '.. the minimum Input current (Iport min) as
specified in Table 33-13 for a minimum duration of 75ms ...'
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7 P 78 L 27 # 96
Law, David 3Com
Comment Type E Comment Status A
PICS general. A mandioroty item (eg PSE1) should only have a Yes[] tick box. A
predicated mandatory item (eg PSE2) should only have a N/A[] and a Yes[] tick box.
SuggestedRemedy
See comment.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.
Editor to make changes offline, this is a lot of editing.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.3 P 79 L 46 # 97
Law, David 3Com
Comment Type E Comment Status A
The optional item MAN is not really the support of Management, it is the support to access
management registers through a MII Management Interface. A PSE that supports a MIB
through a uP interface into some form of PSE module could reasonably be described as
'supporting management' however it is not required to meet the requirements that MAN
predicates.
SuggestedRemedy
Change the text 'PSE supports management' to read 'PSE support management resisters
access throughout MII Management Interface.'
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

P802.3af Draft 4.1 Comments

CI 33A **SC figure 33A.6** **P** **95** **L** **32** **#** **43**
 Darshan, Yair PowerDsine
Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
 Error in the drawing.
 Should be 15V>Vz>20V.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change from 10.1<Vz<15VShould be 15V>Vz>20V.
Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 Original voltage is correct (but changed in D4.1 comments), but for clarity:

 10.1V<Vz<14.5V

 Add note: Zener threshold enables current source between the detection and classificatior
 voltage ranges.

CI 33C **SC Table 33C.1** **P** **97** **L** **19** **#** **33**
 Goldis, Mordechai Avaya
Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
 The heading of the table is wrong
SuggestedRemedy
 It should be as in clause 33.2.2 Table 33-1
Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 Leave first heading 'Terminal' as is. Change other three headings to match table 33-1.

CI 33C **SC TABLE 33C.1** **P** **97** **L** **20** **#** **44**
 Darshan, Yair PowerDsine
Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
 Updated table 33c.1 titles to reflect table 33-1 titles.
SuggestedRemedy
 Updated table 33c.1 titles to reflect table 33-1 titles.
Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 Comment resolved by resolution of comment #33.

CI 33 **SC figure 33c.6** **P** **104** **L** **25** **#** **41**
 Darshan, Yair PowerDsine
Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
 Update figure 33c.6 to reflect the changes done in page 52 lines 11-12.
SuggestedRemedy
 Update figure 33c.6 to reflect the changes done in page 52 lines 11-12.
Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
 ACCEPT.