

comments

Cl 33 SC 6a.4 P 86 L # 60  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc  
 Figure 33-20  
 It is not clear from the text whether the initialize state is prior to Power-ON or prior to DLL classification (after Power-ON)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Explain in text which of the two cases initialize state stands for  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The state machine as drawn does not reflect the comments as resolved. Add a state called "Loss of Communication" per 208 and 61. Clarification portion is OBE by comments on loss of communication

Cl 33 SC 6a.4 P 87 L # 61  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc  
 There are three scenarios due to DLL fault condition  
 - Data link not established after Power-ON resulting in systems using the power values established over physical layer classification  
 - Loss in L2 communication resulting in systems reverting to last acknowledged DLL power value  
 - Loss in L2 communication or Data Link not established after Power-ON resulting in PSE optionally power-cycling the PD after TBD time period  
 These 3 scenarios have not been clearly mentioned in the text  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Mention the 3 scenarios in text.  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment partially OBE by 208  
 Change paragraph on line 15+ in 33.6a into a separate section. Highlight 3 scenarios. Scenarios 2 and 3 dealt with in 208. Use new text from 208.  
 AND  
 Add the following for the first scenario:  
 "If DLL fails to come up within TBD3 after the PSE has turned Power to the PD and the PSE identified the PD as Type 2 via the Physical Layer, the PSE shall remove power."  
 TBD3 to be defined by the L2 adhoc

Cl 33 SC 6a.1.3 P 83 L 5 # 158  
 McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc  
 Byte 1 is wrong, it shows a value of 127 for the entire byte.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Byte 1 to  
 TLV Type (bits 7 - 1) = 127 - organizationally specific type  
 TLV length (bit 0) = MSB of length of information string  
 Change Byte 2 to  
 TLV length (bit 7 to 0) = bits 7 to 0 of length of information string  
 Repeat changes for other TLVs  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change/combine first 2 rows from 1,2 to 1 - 2 and repeat throughout per comment remedy

Cl 33 SC 2 P 18 L 3 # 170  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A  
 Delete the phrase "as the name implies,". It adds no value  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the phrase "as the name implies,"  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 "as the acronym implies,"

comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 171  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Regarding the figures and for the purpose of this review it may be easier to include the figures being replaced with the original figure with a strike through it (or through the title) so its easy to see the changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Pls. see comment

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We are doing a wholesale replace of clause 33. the replace and change commands are only for TF benefit to show modified text. Change commands will be removed before submitted.

Acceptance of comment makes no change to text.

TF to decide if they want editor to pull figures from AF and place back in draft with a strike through.

Alternatively, you can get copies of AF for free and just refer to that. See the comment editor if you need help getting the PDF.

Cl 33 SC 2.10 P 46 L 21 # 175  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

In comment 268 of the D0.9 database we agreed to remove power if certain timeout conditions were met when DLL (L2) is running. I believe a simple mention that power may be removed under certain conditions when L2 is running and a pointer to 33.6 is needed here.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the sentence

"Power may also be removed under certain timeout scenarios as described in 33.6 when DLL classification is running".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

sentence should be inserted after sentence on line 13.

Cl 33 SC 6 P 76 L 10 # 176  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

I believe that the text as it stands now was reviewed by the adhoc and was accepted by comments on D0.9 so the editor's note can be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove the editor's note

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 6a.1.1 P 82 L 41 # 177  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

In light of our decision to own our own TLVs then we no longer need the reference to ANSI.

SuggestedRemedy

Please turn the first sentence into an editor's note that is to be removed prior to publication:

Editor's note: The minimum status TLV definition follows the format defined in ANSI/TIA-1057 for Media Endpoint Discovery.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 6a.4.1 P 87 L 12 # 178  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The collision mechanism is a work item of the L2 adhoc per comment 267 of the D0.9 database. As such the text has not been accepted and is being worked on.

SuggestedRemedy

Please mark this paragrtaph on the collision with an editor's item that it is a place holder until we complete work on it.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 179  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Per comment 233 of D0.9 we need to look at the changes to Clause 30 (30.9 and 30.10) once the state machines are done.

SuggestedRemedy

Placeholder comment to update the attributes in management once the state machines are stable.

Suggest circulating the relevant C30 text (30.9 and 30.10) with the next draft, adding an editor's not upfront that these attributes need to be updated when the underlying statemachines are stable.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Acceptance results in no change to text.

Not ready to add Clause 30 yet.

Cl 33 SC 1.1 P 15 L 53 # 180  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The new text is innacurate. It should be lower than Class D and not including Class D.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "of Class D or lower" to "lower than Class D"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 230

Cl 33 SC 1.5 P 17 L 43 # 181  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The requirement as written suggests that Type requires only Class D. I believe the intent was to clarify that for Class D we want <= 25 ohms and not to limit to class D.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Type 2 operation requires Class D cabling"

to

"Type 2 operation requires Class D or better cabling. When Class D cabling is used, "

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Type 2 operation requires Class D cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995. The cabling..."

to "Type 2 operation requires Class D or better cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995. When Class D cabling is used, the cabling.."

Cl 33 SC Figure 33-6 P 28 L 54 # 185  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The name of the figure is inconsistant with the convention we voted on at the last meeting (diab\_2\_1007.pdf). Specifically, this diagram shows a PSE that has one event classification. It has nothing to do with the Type.

SuggestedRemedy

Please rename the figure to PSE Implementing One Event Classification State Diagram

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

comments

CI 33 SC Figure 33-7b P31 L 26 # 187  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 The name of the figure is inconsistent with the convention we voted on at the last meeting (diab\_2\_1007.pdf). Specifically, this diagram shows a DLL which can be used in a Type 1 as well. It has nothing to do with the Type.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please rename the figure to PSE Implementing DLL Classification State Diagram  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC Figure 33-7c P32 L 40 # 188  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 The name of the figure is inconsistent with the convention we voted on at the last meeting (diab\_2\_1007.pdf). Specifically, this diagram shows a PSE that is doing two event classification. It has nothing to do with the Type.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please rename the figure to PSE Implementing Two Event Classification State Diagram  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC Figures 33-7b and 7c P31 L # 189  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R  
 Please move diagrams 33-7b and 33-7c to the appropriate classification sections. The state machine can remain a high level behavioural diagram  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please move diagrams 33-7b and 33-7c to the appropriate classification sections.  
 Response Response Status W  
 REJECT.  
 but 33-7b and 33-7c are state diagrams and this is the state diagram section of 33.2. If we move them are you suggesting we no longer call them state diagrams?  
 see 186 which requests to delete 33-7a.

CI 33 SC 2.7 P35 L 32 # 190  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 Table 33-2a does not have any introductory text associated with it.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please add the following sentence prior to the Table:  
 "An 802.3at PSE or a PD implementing classification shall meet one of the permutaiuons listed in Table 33-2a"  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE see 159

CI 33 SC 2.7 P35 L 32 # 191  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 Table 33-2a does not accurately reflect the motion and text we adopted in October. The motion asked for incorporating all the text in diab\_2\_1007.pdf. This includes the footnotes.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please include the footnotes to the table  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE

comments

Cl 33 SC 2.7 P36 L # 192  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Section 33.2.7 does not accurately reflect the decisions we adopted in October. Specifically the motion relating to diab\_2\_1007.pdf, comment 225 and 161.

Moreover, not every case in the table is described in the text. For instance, the case of a Type 2 PSE with 802.3-2005 compatible one event classification and DLL is not covered. The failed motion at the end of the interim session seems to have been inadvertently implemented as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Please rewrite this section in accordance with the motion relating to diab\_2\_1007.pdf, comment 225 and 161 as agreed to in October.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 39

comment might be asking for more than resolved by 39 but the lack of details in remedy leaves TF with no direction to complete comment. Please include specific examples of excluded text in next comment.

Cl 33 SC 2.7.2 P37 L 42 # 194  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Please delete the word Type 1. This describes PSE one event classification which is independent of Type as agreed to in October per the Table and motion relating to diab\_2\_1007.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the word Type 1.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 147

see 193

Cl 33 SC 2.7.2 P37 L 44 # 195  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Please delete the word Type 1. This describes PSE one event classification which is independent of Type as agreed to in October per the Table and motion relating to diab\_2\_1007.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the word Type 1.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Deleting Type 1 means a Type 2 PSE must treat overload as class 0 and the TF agrees this is not the proper choice. We don't agree on the proper method to handle this but we agree Class 0 is not it.

see 193

Cl 33 SC 2.7.2a P38 L 48 # 196  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The 2-event physical layer classification defines a two finger approach, I do not recall that we decided to omit any of the first two fingers. That is now achieved by the one event description.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove the text associated with omitting any fingers, that is now achieved by the one event description.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

2-Event omitting the second finger <-> 1-Event.

comments

Cl 33 SC Table 33-5 P40 L 11 # 197  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The PSE Type column introduces inconsistencies with the nomenclature we adopted at the Octoer meeting. For example, the Type does not make sense when we are refering to classification parameters, these are one-finger or two finger.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert another colum that reads One or Two Finger Physical Classification. For parameters that are related to the classification fill in that column and leave the Type colum blank. And vice versa for the Type.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 245

Cl 33 SC 4.8.1.4 P74 L 14 # 203  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

I believe the change here was based on comment 82 from the D0.9 database that we agreed to AIP after we reviewed with Alan. Upon further review, it was agreed that the original text was indeed correct as it asked for components of higher quality per the 2002 standard and the change should have not been made.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please revert to the original text per the rejected comment

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE - find comment number

response from Alan:

"As I see it, there are 2 ways to resolve this:

1. Reference Class D 1995 (and therefore Cat 5 1995 cords, connectors, etc) but impose a 25ohm DCLR requirement instead of 40ohms specified by Class D 1995. This will meet existing cable and DCLR objectives.

2. Reference Class D 2002 (and therefore Cat 5 2002, i.e. Cat 5e, cords, connectors, etc) which will meet the 25ohm DCLR objective. This will require you to amend the cabling objective.

I don't see any other options."

and further clarification from David:

"Hi Alan,

I believe I now understand what is going on here. The comment reads as follows:

Comment: 82

Clause: 33

SubClause: 4.8.1.4

Page: 55

Line: 1

Comment Type: TR

Comment: Category 5 is obsolete now that 1000BASE-T is supported.

SuggestedRemedy: Change to Category 5E.

The subclause in question reads:

33.4.8.1.4 Work area or equipment cable Midspan PSE

comments

Replacing the work area or equipment cable with a cable that includes a Midspan PSE should not alter the requirements of the cable. This cable shall meet the requirements of this clause and the specifications for a Category 5 (jumper) cord as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:2002 for insertion loss, NEXT, and return loss for the transmit and receive pairs.

So this text is saying that if a cable includes a Midspan that cable shall meet the Category 5 (jumper) specification in ISO/IEC 11801:2002. Now, correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding is that ISO/IEC 11801 defines components as Categories and channels as Classes. Hence to form, for example, a Class E channel, Category 6 components such as connectors and jumpers have to be used. Now in the case of ISO/IEC 11801:2002 the specification for Category 5 and Class D were updated from that found in ISO/IEC 11801:1995. Hence a ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Category 5 jumper is equivalent to a TIA/EIA 568 Category 5e jumper.

Based on this I think this comment should be rejected. The rejection should state that a ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Category 5 jumper is equivalent to a TIA/EIA 568 Category 5e jumper.

Regards,  
David"

Cl 33 SC 6.1.1.1b P77 L38 # 205  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

Bit 11.4 does not accurately reflect the changes agreed to from the last meeting. 11.4 should simple represent Physical Layer Classification and not 2-Event classification. Presumably the PSE will implement a physical classification scheme, the DLL can then be enabled. Whether it is a 1-event or 2-event does not matter within this context.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:  
- Drop 2-event from the bit name so that it is simply Physical Layer Classification

OR

- Add an extra bit from the reserved field to represent 1-event physical layer classification. If this is done, there now needs to be restriction on what happens if both 2-event and 1-event are asserted. For this reason, the commenter prefers the first suggested remedy.

This applies to the entire subsection

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Combine 33.6.1.1.1a and 33.6.1.1.1b. Rename section to Enable Classification. Drop 2-event from the bit name. Revise text.

Cl 33 SC Table 33-5 P77 L10 # 204  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

Bit 11.4 does not accurately reflect the changes agreed to from the last meeting. 11.4 should simple represent Physical Layer Classification and not 2-Event classification. Presumably the PSE will implement a physical classification scheme, the DLL can then be enabled. Whether it is a 1-event or 2-event does not matter within this context.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:  
- Drop 2-event from the bit name so that it is simply Physical Layer Classification

OR

- Add an extra bit from the reserved field to represent 1-event physical layer classification. If this is done, there now needs to be restriction on what happens if both 2-event and 1-event are asserted. For this reason, the commenter prefers the first suggested remedy.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement suggested option 1. Drop 2-event from name.

comments

Cl 33 SC Table 33-16 P79 L 10 # 206  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

Bit 12.13 does not accurately reflect the changes agreed to from the last meeting. 12.13 should simply represent Physical Layer Classification and not 2-Event classification. Whether it is a 1-event or 2-event does not matter within this context.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:  
- Drop 2-event from the bit name so that it is simply Physical Layer Classification

OR

- Add an extra bit from the reserved field to represent 1-event physical layer classification. If this is done, there now needs to be restriction on what happens if both 2-event and 1-event are asserted. For this reason, the commenter prefers the first suggested remedy.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Combine the two bits 11.5 and 11.4. Show all 4 combinations. Remove the term 2-event. (11.5) (11.4)

- 1 1 = Data Link Layer Enabled and Physical Layer Classification Enabled
- 1 0 = Data Link Layer Enabled and Physical Layer Classification Disabled
- 0 1 = Data Link Layer Disabled and Physical Layer Classification Enabled
- 0 0 = Data Link Layer Disabled and Physical Layer Classification Disabled

Cl 33 SC 6.1.2.1b P78 L 50 # 207  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

Bit 12.13 does not accurately reflect the changes agreed to from the last meeting. 12.13 should simply represent Physical Layer Classification and not 2-Event classification. Whether it is a 1-event or 2-event does not matter within this context.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:  
- Drop 2-event from the bit name so that it is simply Physical Layer Classification

OR

- Add an extra bit from the reserved field to represent 1-event physical layer classification. If this is done, there now needs to be restriction on what happens if both 2-event and 1-event are asserted. For this reason, the commenter prefers the first suggested remedy.

This applies to the entire subsection

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement suggested option 1. Drop 2-event from name



comments

Cl 33 SC 6a P 82 L 15 # 208  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

This sentence does not accurately reflect the resolution to comment #268. It reflects part of the resolution to the comment. It does not address the timeout aspects.

SuggestedRemedy

Please append the following sentence. If a loss of management frame communication persists past the TBD1 LLDP timeout and TBD2 timeout, the PSE may remove power.

The TBD1 and TBD2 are work items for the L2 adhoc per comment #268.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Please append the following sentence: "If a loss of management frame communication persists past the TBD1 LLDP timeout and TBD2 timeout, the PSE shall remove power."

TBD1 is set by the TTL of the TLV and TBD2 will be in addition to TBD1 and are work items for the L2 adhoc per comment #268.

AND

Append the following sentence following the one above:  
"The PSE may remove power at any time per Figure 33-6."

Cl 33 SC 6a P 82 L 18 # 209  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

The exact timeout numbers for the L2 numbers need to be defined by the adhoc. This comment is intended to be a placeholder for that work.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 208

Cl 33 SC Figure 33-20 P 86 L 10 # 210  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

A priority needs to be defined between on the exit condition from the RUNNING state. As it stands it is possible for both these conditions to be asserted.

SuggestedRemedy

For a PSE, I would recomend that the Local Request takes precedence. For a PD the remote request should take precedence.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Prioritize right branch. Qualify condition with !((local system desires a change) \* denial\_timer\_done) to the left branch leaving RUNNING STATE. New condition should read (remRequestedPowerValue != remActualPowerValue) \* (!((local system desires a change) \* denial\_timer\_done))

Cl 33 SC Figure 33-20 P 86 L 40 # 211  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

It is a noble goal to try and keep the same state machine for both sides of the link (PSE and PD), however, we fundamentally have a different behavior. Whether we do this by renaming the same variables or not, it still is 2 different machines.

SuggestedRemedy

Please replicate Figure 33-20 again and label the first for a PSE and the second for a PD. We can maintain the same structure for both but this will allow clear analysis of any conflict conditions that may arise

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replicate the Figure 33-20 per suggested remedy. Retain same state names and transitions. Rename variables that depend on a state with PSE\_ and PD\_ and define them separately (for example PSE and PD specific timers).

comments

Cl 33 SC 6a.4.1 P 87 L 19 # 212  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Per the classification baseline, the PSE treats the PD as a Type 1 Class 4 until the L2 engine is up.

SuggestedRemedy

Please append the following sentence to line 14: In the event the classification that is returned from the Physical Layer is Class 4, then the PSE treats the PD as a Type 1 Class 4 PD until the DLL classification engine completes.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE - find comment

only if the PSE used 1-event, if it used 2-event then it is type 2 class 4.  
page 87 line 14 does not seem like the right location - where??? Line 19 as the comment line states?

Cl 33 SC Figure 33-20 P 86 L 40 # 214  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A L2 adhoc

The state machine does not accurately reflect the resolution to comment #268. It reflects part of the resolution to the comment. It does not address the second timeout aspect.

SuggestedRemedy

The state machine should show the optional power removal after the second timeout.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE see 60

Cl 33 SC 33.2.7.2a P 38 L 48 # 272  
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The text 'If the result of the first class event is Class 4, the PSE may omit the subsequent mark and class events only if the PSE implements Data Link Layer classification. In this case, the Type 2 PSE shall assume it is powering a Type 1 PD until successful Data Link Layer classification is performed.' should be deleted as it isn't correct anymore.

According to table 33-2a a Type 2 PSE can choose to do either 1-Event or 2-Event classification. If it chooses to do 1-Event classification it is mandatory that it supports DLL.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this paragraph.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Paragraph has been significantly modified. Please review and comment if not fixed.

Cl 33 SC 2.8 P 41 L 37 # 273  
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

1-Event and 2-Event Classification is orthogonal to the PSE Type, see Table 33-2a.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the entries in the PSE Type column to read '1,2' and differentiate the two rows of item 20 as being 1-Event and 2-Event.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE - 245???