

comments

CI 33 SC 6 P L # 268
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X dll

We need to consider what happens when there is a loss of communication more carefully. Simply throttling the power back to the HW level does not make sense as the device is hosed

SuggestedRemedy

At the very least the PSE should support the last negotiated state not the HW state as it is not guranteed what the device will do if the power is throttled back.

Additionally, we can look at mechanisms like power cycling within certain time limits that we specify to try and get the agent up and running.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 33 SC 6.2 P61 L # 266
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X dll

The TLV descriptions are a summary of what is in ANSI/TIA 1057. In addition to a risk that at some point these two standards may differ, the information needs to be elaborated on

SuggestedRemedy

Either do this whole thing by reference or incorporate the entire descriptions from ANSI/TIA 1057-2006

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 33 SC 6.2.1 P61 L43 # 240
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status X dll

Do we have a release from ANSI/TIA to copy material into our draft?

SuggestedRemedy

If needed, please work with the staff or alert them to this issue

Proposed Response Response Status W

see 217

CI 33 SC 6.2.1 P61 L43 # 217
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status X dll

Can we reproduce the ANSI TLV in the 802.3 document?

SuggestedRemedy

Please reproduce the TLV in the 802.3 document, or at the very least circulate with the review package

Proposed Response Response Status W

Bring this is with Law.

CE Note: comment was missing comment type. CE set it to E.

See 240

CI 33 SC 6.2.1 P61 L43 # 43
Patoka, Martin TI

Comment Type E Comment Status X dll

"The minimum status TLV definition follows the format defined in ANSI/TIA-1057"

The paragraph number may change by document revision

SuggestedRemedy

Add the document revision, data, etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W

See 217

CI 33 SC 6.3.2 P63 L27 # 198
Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X dll

The PD power in not completely specified.

SuggestedRemedy

The PD power should represent its peak 1 second average power.

Proposed Response Response Status O

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 33
SC 6.3.2

Page 1 of 2
9/18/2007 4:29:44

comments

CI 33 **SC 6.4** **P64** **L6** # 84
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X** dll

State diagram has a number of undefined variables

SuggestedRemedy

Define all variables used in the state diagram.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

CI 33 **SC 6.4.1** **P65** **L7** # 267
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X** dll

The "collision" mechanism needs to be thought out a little more. Specifically, the cases that occur. For example, if the PD is requesting more power and PSE is requesting less power may be a different situation than if both are requesting more power. The timers may not be the best way to resolve the conflict

Also, the term collision is confusing and should be avoided.

SuggestedRemedy

Seperate state machines for the PSE and PD should be done. In each state machine, if a new request is received a behaviour can be defined

In this paradigm we can identify what would constitute a conflict that needs to be resolved.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**
