IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

63 C/ 30 SC 30.2.3 P**22** L10 Cl 33 SC 33.1 P35 L20 # 176 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Thompson, Geoff Nortel Comment Type E Comment Status D Comment Type E Comment Status D ez There is a mixture of Times and Arial fonts in the diagrams clause references. Item "c" is incorrect. The issue is not whether or not a device "requires" power. Rather, it is whether or not it "requests" power from the host system. SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Make all fonts agree. Pick Times or Arial. Change "c" to read: Proposed Response Response Status W "A protocol allowing the detection of a device that requests power from a PSE." PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT. 802.3at Editor resquested to provide preference on font L26 # 65 C/ 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L40 C/ 30 SC 30.9.2.1.1 P30 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Comment Type E Comment Status D Comment Type TR Comment Status D ez ez Units are "W" when they should be Ohms. Reference to "PDID" should be a reference to "aPDID." SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Fix units. Replace "PDID" with "aPDID." Proposed Response Proposed Response Response Status W Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT. PROPOSED ACCEPT. C/ 33 SC 33.1 P35 L12 # 175 CI 33 SC 33.2.4.2 P45 L48 # 21 Thompson, Geoff Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation Nortel Comment Status D Comment Type E Comment Status D Comment Type ez ez The sense of the term "supply/draw power" is inverted from the rest of the paragraph. That Startup is related to Figure 33-14 and not Figure 33-15 is, in the first sentence the PD goes before the PSE. SuggestedRemedy Please align. Change line 2 from .. "and Figure 33-15" to ".. and Figure 33-14" SuggestedRemedy Proposed Response Response Status W Change: "supply/draw power" PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs "draw/supply power" Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

C/ 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P46 L3 # 231 Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L41 # 70 Law. David 3Com LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Comment Type Comment Status D Comment Type E Comment Status D Ε ez ez Suggest that 'PSE does not perform 1-Event or 2-Event Physical Layer classification.' Figure title does not mention the monitor inrush function. should read 'PSE does not perform Physical Layer classification.'. SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Add "monitor inrush" to figure title. See comment. Proposed Response Response Status W Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE, frs PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P53 L42 Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P**47** L30 # 228 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation 3Com Law, David Comment Type Ε Comment Status D ez Comment Status D Comment Type E ez The title of Figure 33-11 is not complete 'power not available' is not in correct alphabetical position in variable list. SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Change from: See comment. "Figure 33-11-PSE monitor overload, monitor short, and monitor MPS Proposed Response Response Status W state diagrams" PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs. To: Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P48 18 # 232 "Figure 33-11-PSE monitor overload, monitor short, monitor MPS and moitor inrush state Law, David 3Com diagrams" Comment Type T Comment Status D Proposed Response Response Status W The performs classification variable has been removed from the state diagram (it's PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. frs function has been replaced by class_num_events) and no longer appears in the variable definition subclause other than in this table (33-3). **OBE 70** SugaestedRemedy CI 33 SC 33.2.5 P53 L47 # 71 Remove the performs_classification column from Table 33-3. LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs Comment Type E Comment Status D ez "In an operational mode" sounds vague. SuggestedRemedy From: In an operational mode, the PSE ... In any operational mode, the PSE ... Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs

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

C/ **33** SC **33.2.5** Page 2 of 4 9/15/2008 7:19:08 PM

IEEE P802.3at D3.1 PoEplus comments

C/ 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P59 L22 # 75 Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P63 L25 # 91 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Comment Type E Comment Status D Comment Type T Comment Status D ez ez VMark should be properly subscripted. This equation is very similar to Equation (33-1), in that it allows for variation of parameters based on actual port voltage and channel resistance. SuggestedRemedy Subscript 'Mark.' Except it actually doesn't allow for channel resistance variation. Where Equation (33-1) uses a factor of RChan, which MAY BE RCh, this equation uses only RCh (which will be Proposed Response Response Status W worst case). PROPOSED ACCEPT. Also, a forward reference to PPeak PD would be useful. Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P62 **L7** # 90 SuggestedRemedy LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS Replace RCh with RChan, where RChan is the channel resistance, whose worst case value Comment Type TR Comment Status D is RCh. ez TRise units were incorrectly noted as ms when restoring this spec from 802.3af. PPeak_PD is the peak power a PD may draw for its class; see Table 33-17. SuggestedRemedy Proposed Response Response Status W Change 'ms' to 'us.' PROPOSED ACCEPT. frs Proposed Response Response Status W Great catch! PROPOSED ACCEPT. OBE 45 C/ 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P66 L20 # 160 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P62 L7 # 45 Microsemi Corporation Darshan, Yair Comment Type TR Comment Status D The reference to PD upper bound template is obsolete since we changed the nomenclature Comment Type TR Comment Status D ez to PSE lower bound template Item 15 should be usec and not msec SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Change PD upper bound template to PSE lower bound template Change to usec Proposed Response Response Status W Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs.

C/ 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P66 L20 # 61 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics Comment Type T Comment Status D ez The PD upperbound template is no more defined. Now it is called PSE lowerbound template. SuggestedRemedy Replace "PD upperbound template" with "PSE lowerbound template" Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT, frs **OBE 160** CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P**79** L14 # 137 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Comment Type ER Comment Status D ez Table 33-18 item 7 1.114 x Pclass is incorrect SuggestedRemedy Change to 1.114 x Pclass_PD Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT. CI 33 SC 33.4.8.1.4 P**94** L19 # 115 Schindler, Fred Cisco Comment Type E Comment Status D ez Correct the typo, "Mispan." SuggestedRemedy Replace "Mispan" with "Midspan." Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.