

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 325
Nadeau, Gerard

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

*** Comment submitted with the file 31532000024-GRN_comments.csv attached ***

This comment is to ensure that all comments supplied by Gerard Nadeau are in fact captured. Comments were supplied in 802.3 Working Group ballot file format and were manually transferred in to the inferior IEEE ballot tool. The original comment file is attached to ensure completeness.

SuggestedRemedy

Review Rogue comments entered by the chair and verify all of Mr Nadeau's comments are included.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Accepting comment results in no change to text.

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L29 # 30
Landry, David Silicon Laboratories

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There may be confusion about which portion of the PHY test fixture is the device-under-test and which portion corresponds to the test circuit itself.

SuggestedRemedy

Draw a dashed line through the terminals, and annotate the left side with "DUT" and the right side with "test circuit"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See 219 for additional text.

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L30 # 219
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Suggest the MDI should be marked in Figure 25-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Mark the boxes with a cross in them with a vertical dotted line that is annotated MDI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 30, and add MDI.

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L34 # 214
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There should be a separate figure numbers and titles for the transmitter load circuit diagram and the time constant measurement diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a title to the upper diagram that reads 'Type 2 system time constant test load' and change the title to the second diagram to read 'Type 2 system time constant measurement'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L41 # 123
Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

p19, l41. A small negative sign is sometimes missed.

SuggestedRemedy

Reformat the equation to remove the negative sign.
 $\tau = T/\ln(V_a/V_c)$

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L50 # 31
Landry, David Silicon Laboratories

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The terms "test circuit" and "test fixture" are used inconsistently.

SuggestedRemedy

Standardize on one term, preferably "test circuit."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "test fixture" with "test circuit."

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L51 # 166
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

*** Comment submitted with the file 31476500024-Modifiedfigure25-1Rev003.pdf attached

Draft D4.0 (SA) Note 1 page 19 line 51 says:
 (This comment is replacing other similar comment that I have sent on the subject)
 "NOTE 1-The value of the 100 ohm termination resistor can be adjusted to compensate for the test circuit resistance.
 The test circuit resistance should exceed 2 kohm."
 Following my objective of clarifying the text in order to reduce the amount of test conditions interpretations I am suggesting to modify figure 25-1 for better clarity:
 1. Mark were the PI starts and ends as we did in other drawings.
 2. Add the label "Termination" near the 100 ohm resistor

SuggestedRemedy

Modify figure 25-1 for better clarity as follows (see attached file: modified figure 25-1 rev 003.pdf):
 -Mark were the PI starts and ends as we did in other drawings.
 -Add the label Termination near the 100 ohm resistor

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 30, 219, 214

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L51 # 1
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4
 Figure 25-1 title:
 The title use "test fixture" and the text in Note 1 use "test circuit"
 Let's use the same term in both.

SuggestedRemedy

To pick one of the terms and synchronize between Figure 25-1 title and Note 1 text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 31

Cl 25 SC 25.4.4a.1 P19 L51 # 14
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4.0 Note 1 page 19 line 51 says:
 "NOTE 1-The value of the 100 ohm termination resistor can be adjusted to compensate for the test circuit resistance.
 The test circuit resistance should exceed 2 kohm."
 Following my objective of clarifying the text in order to reduce the amount of test conditions interpretations I have few questions that may be needed to be clarified:
 1. What is "the test circuit resistance" which part of figure 25-1 is it?
 Is it the PHI output resistance that determines I_{bias}?
 If this is the intention then modify the text to be:
 "NOTE 1-The value of the 100 ? termination resistor can be adjusted to compensate for the test circuit resistance which is defined as $|v_1-v_2|/I_{bias}$. The test circuit resistance should exceed 2 k?."
 See attached "modified Figure 25-1" proposal for clarifying the issue.
 2. The text " ..can be adjusted to compensate for ..": It is not clear why a compensation is required. If the intent is to adjust the 100 ohm in order to compensate the effect of the 2 2Kohm on the total equivalent termination resistance then modify the text to:
 "NOTE 1-The value of the 100 ? termination resistor can be adjusted to compensate for the effect of the test circuit resistance which is defined as $|v_1-v_2|/I_{bias}$, on the total equivalent termination resistor. The test circuit resistance should exceed 2 k?."
 See attached "modified Figure 25-1" proposal for clarifying the issue.

SuggestedRemedy

Group to clarify it.
 My proposal is:
 1. Add V1, V2 labels to I_{bias} terminals in Figure 25-1 (See attached drawing "modified figure 25-1").
 2. Modify Note 1 text to be:
 "NOTE 1-The value of the 100 ohm termination resistor can be adjusted to compensate for the effect of the test circuit resistance which is defined as $|v_1-v_2|/I_{bias}$, on the total equivalent termination resistor. The test circuit resistance should exceed 2 kohm."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 30, 219, 214

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P37 L21 # 363
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Missing comma
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "In an Endpoint PSE and in a PD, the PI is encompassed within the MDI."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11 P66 L34 # 183
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 a condition exists, conditions exist
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace exists with exist.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P37 L53 # 181
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 "related to but not equivalent to the" -- Missing commas?
 SuggestedRemedy
 related to, but not equivalent to, the...
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P67 L48 # 62
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 "the PI of the PSE PI" is redundant redundant.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "the PSE PI"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.1 P38 L51 # 328
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 *** Comment submitted with the file 31532300024-GRN_comments.csv attached ***
 Either add a comma to the first sentence or subtract one from the second (add being preferred.) Be consistent with lists
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "PSEs can be compatible with 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and/or 1000BASE-T. PSEs may support either Alternative A, Alternative B, or both." or "PSEs can be compatible with 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX and/or 1000BASE-T. PSEs may support either Alternative A, Alternative B or both."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 FYI: The comment tool added a bogus reference to an attachment that does not exist.
 Should read "PSEs can be compatible with 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and/or 1000BASE-T. PSEs may support either Alternative A, Alternative B, or both."

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P68 L37 # 66
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 These notes on Rpd_d and Cpd_d should not be part of the figure title. They should be part of the figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Take the notes out of the title, and add to them to the figure above.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P68 L52 # 67
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Figure 33-17 seems rather devoid of meaningful content. In fact, denoting an AC impedance as a resistor may mislead people.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike Figure 33-17.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Strike Figure 33-17.
 Adjust references to Figure 33-17 as required.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P68 L7 # 64
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ
 Table entry 3c is another scavenger hunt that is unnecessary, since the reader should already have read about TMPDO in the Table 33-11, and the dropout behavior is explicitly defined in text in section 33.2.11.1.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete item 3c.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.2 P39 L2 # 124
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 p39, l2. These definitions are copies of what is presented on p17.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reference the definitions rather than repeating them or use a word processing feature that keeps the definitions consistent.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Instruct the Editor to determine and use the best way to keep definitions consistent.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.3 P43 L42 # 329
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 *** Comment submitted with the file 31532400024-GRN_comments.csv attached ***
 Add commas around "in some cases"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "For the purposes of data transfer, the type of PSE data port is relevant to the far-end PD and, in some cases, to the cabling system between them."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Ed note: note referring to attachment was mistakenly added in the Rogue comment interface. Please ignore.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P44 L15 # 125
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 p44, l15. A system with a Type 1 PSE and a Type 2 midspan may be constructed to power Type 2 PDs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following note to the end of section 33.2.4.1,
 Note: A Type 1 Alternative A, PSE may need to have its DTE Power ability disabled when it is attached to the same link segments as a Type 2 Alternative B, midspan PSE.
 This allows the Type 2 Alternative B, midspan to successfully complete a detection cycle.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P44 L24 # 332
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 The phrase "that is" is unnecessary and slightly awkward.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "If a PSE performing detection using Alternative B detects an open circuit (see 33.2.7.3) on the link section, then that PSE may optionally omit the detection backoff."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P44 L21 # 2
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4
 There is no such term PD Inrush.
 It should be "PD Inrush current"

SuggestedRemedy

Lines 21 and 22 (two occurrences): Replace "PD inrush" with "PD inrush current"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Assume this is page 45.

Accept the suggestion.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P45 L30 # 334
 McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

"when" is unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "If monitoring both components of the MPS, the DC component of MPS" or you could add "when" on line 33.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Should read "If monitoring both components of the MPS, the DC component of MPS."

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P46 L20 # 128
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

p46, 20. This text does not cover the state where TEST_MODE result in DTE power.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence to the end of pi_powered, TRUE sentence.
 ... to be powered, or power is being forced on in TEST_MODE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P47 L10 # 335
 McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

"with pse_skips_event2." seems unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "The PSE can choose to bypass a portion of the classification state flow."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

"The PSE can choose to bypass a portion of the classification state flow."

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P46 L12 # 337
 McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Replace comma with semicolon

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "... MPS; see ... "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Assume this is page 48.

The editor should adjust this text as appropriate. The suggested solution is consistent with text on the same page.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P46 L15 # 338
 McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Replace comma with semicolon

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "... time; see ... "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Assume this is page 48.

The editor should adjust this text as appropriate. The suggested solution is consistent with text on the same page.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P46 L17 # 339
McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** EZ
Replace comma with semicolon

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "... turn-on; see ..."

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

The editor should adjust this text as appropriate. The suggested solution is consistent with text on the same page.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P47 L41 # 336
McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** EZ
Period following "addition" should be a colon (if the text following the word is the addition.)

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "All timers operate in the manner described in 14.2.3.2 with the following addition: A timer is reset ..."

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

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P49 L6 # 340
McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** EZ
Verb does not agree with subject

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "This function returns a variable: ", also fix on line 15

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

On line 6 and 15, replace "return" with "returns."

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P48 L31 # 132
Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** EZ
This text is easily confused with PD detection.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "PD detection" with "PD classification."

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

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P48 L32 # 133
Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** EZ
p48, 32. Specifications cover compliant behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence.

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

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P48 L41 # 36
Landry, David Silicon Laboratories

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

This sentence has some issues: "The variable signature as defined in 33.2.7 and the variable mr_valid_signature." First, the variable signature is NOT defined in 33.2.7, which describes the method of detection probing and the electrical parameters of a valid PD detection signature but makes no mention of any state diagram variables. Second, this sentence seems redundant, as it is naming two variable which are reproduced immediately below.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence on line 41.

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

Strike the sentence on line 41 and modify the sentence on line 40 from "This function . variables:" to "This function . variables used to model PSE detection covered in 33.2.7:"

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P49 L1 # 134
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 p49, 1. Provide text showing what this function does.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following text after the existing text,
 This function produce the classification mark voltage.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5 P52 L46 # 341
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Reads better without the comma and "may"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "Also, a PSE may successfully detect a PD but then opt not to power the
 detected PD."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P49 L15 # 40
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 The word "return" should be plural.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "return" to "returns."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P53 L1 # 238
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Sections 33.2.5 - 33.2.7.3 all seem to be a part of the detection requirements of 33.2.5
 SuggestedRemedy
 Number these sections as a part of the detection section, 33.2.5.x
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P49 L34 # 186
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 This is the first mention of mutual identification, before it is defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 add (see 33.2.8) after mutual identification
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P53 L21 # 342
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Extra commas
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "A functional equivalent of the detection circuit that has no source impedance
 limitation but restricts the PSE
 detection circuit to the first quadrant is shown in Figure 33-13."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P49 L6 # 38
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 The word "return" should be plural.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "return" to "returns."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P53 L48 # 182
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 (as specified in and Table 33--14) -- extra 'and'
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete and: "(as specified in Table 33--14)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 OBE 43

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P53 L48 # 6
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Draft D4.0
 remove the word "and"
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove the word "and" from "..(as specified in ..)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 OBE 43

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P53 L48 # 43
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 There is an extraneous "and" in the parenthetical statement, (as specified in and Table 33-14).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the "and"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P56 L39 # 89
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The term "as soon as" sounds too restrictive
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "after"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P57 L42 # 137
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 p57, 42. Use variables.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "6 ms" with TCLE1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P57 L49 # 47
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 "... at Type 2 PSE shall return ..." should be "... a Type 2 PSE shall return ..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.14 P66 L8 # 60
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 It seems strange to have a section, 33.2.9.14, whose only contents are a NOTE.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Promote the NOTE to a real paragraph.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P62 L31 # 55
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The dangling line from the Rchan definition is improperly indented.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Indent the line so it lines up with the rest of the definition body
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3 P69 L1 # 68
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The title for section 33.3 should follow the title of section 33.2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Powered devices" to "Powered devices (PDs)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P62 L33 # 16
 Heath, Jeffrey Linear Technology
 Comment Type GR Comment Status D EZ
 (this comment may have been accidentally submitted twice)
 PDPeak_PD referent to table 33-17 appears to be incorrect
 SuggestedRemedy
 Line 33 is:
 PPeak_PD is the peak power a PD may draw for its class; see Table 33-17
 New Text for Line 33:
 PPeak_PD is the peak power a PD may draw for its class; see Table 33-18
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P71 L11 # 152
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 p71, 11. State NOT_MDI_POWERED does not exist.
 I believe the state NOT_MDI_POWERED was replaced by IDLE.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace occurrence of "NOT_MDI_POWERED" with "IDLE."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P62 L38 # 168
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 Draft D4.0 33.2.9.6 p. 62 line 38
 The description of the POWER_UP is not complete (regarding PD inrush current) however
 instead of changing the text it will be easier to use make a reference to an existing text in
 other location that completes it as in 33.3.7.3 p.78 line 26.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change lines 37 38 from:
 "POWER_UP mode occurs between the PSE's transition to the POWER_UP state and
 either the expiration of TInrush or the conclusion of PD inrush currents."
 To:
 "POWER_UP mode occurs between the PSE's transition to the POWER_UP state and
 either the expiration of TInrush or the conclusion of PD inrush currents (see 33.3.7.3)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P71 L17 # 153
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 p71, 17. These values are vague.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Power not" with "The PD input voltage does not meet the requirements of Table
 33-18 variable Vport_PD."
 Replace "Power being" with "The PD input voltage meets the requirements of Table 33-18
 variable Vport_PD."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.4 P73 L54 # 11
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4.0
 Table 33-14, Input Inductance.
 The reader may assume that it can be inductance in parallel to the port which is not the case (otherwise port will be shorted at DC voltage). This is "series input inductance".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace Table 33-14 item "Input Inductance" with "Series input inductance"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2.1 P76 L7 # 154
 Schindler, Frederick Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

p76, 7. Replace "0.25 mA minimum" with "Imark."

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P77 L22 # 189
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4.0 (SA)
 Table 33-18 item 9: There is missing information regarding the maximum PD capacitance which is limited by item 5 (PD inrush current of 0.4A as specified in 33.3.7.3)

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the additional information column for item 9:
 See 33.3.7.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P77 L22 # 12
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Draft D4.0
 We had some cleaning work in previous drafts in order to use state machine terms. Here is an other case that need some editing.
 Normal Powering state is "POWER_ON" when we are referring to PSE and "MDI_POWERx" when we are referring to PD.
 Since this is a PD spec let's use the right term

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text in item 9 Table 33-18 from:
 "...during normal powering state"
 to "...during MDI_POWERx state"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Also this term shows up in the PICs PD41, P120 L25.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P78 L47 # 98
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

50ms is a number that needs to be replaced with a variable

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Tovld_min

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P80 L30 # 344
 McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Poor syntax and indentation

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the period after the word "following" with a colon and indent the paragraph immediately below (lines 31 to 35)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor to ask the IEEE editors for guidance for this structure.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.9 P81 L25 # 345
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Poor syntax - delete the extra "or", add comas.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "instability at the PSE side, the PD side, or both due to the presence"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.9 P81 L25 # 79
 Landry, David Silicon Laboratories
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 It seems strange to have a section, 33.3.7.9, whose only contents are a NOTE.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Promote the NOTE to a real paragraph.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8 P81 L41 # 346
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Missing word "to"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should read "Current draw equal to or above the minimum"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4 P82 L21 # 199
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 10BASE-T is a MAU and 100BASE-T and 1000BASE-T are PHYs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change '.. of the PHYs of 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T.' to read '.. of the 10BASE-T MAU and the 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T PHYs.'
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.2 P83 L36 # 203
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 A more direct reference for 100BASE-T, rather than simply Clause 25, would be to subclause 25.4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change '(See 14.3.1.2.7, Clause 25, and 40.8.3.4.)' to read '(See 14.3.1.2.7, 25.4, and 40.8.3.4.)'.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.2 P83 L43 # 196
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Generally clauses other than 33, the 'cm' of 'Ecm' is a subscript.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the 'cm' of 'Ecm' to be a subscript. If this change is made also change the 'cm_out' of 'Ecm_out' and the 'dif' of 'Edif' to be subscripts.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.4 P86 L35 # 195
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Add a note to define DUT
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a note that reads 'DUT - Device under test'.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.9.1 P90 L12 # 349
 McCormack, Meghan
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 The texts says there are three types of midspans but the list enumerates four
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the text say four or eliminate a list item
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.10 P127 L50 # 315
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Table number in text has changed to 33-24 (page 99).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change table reference in Value/Comment field to 33-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P111 L11 # 113
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ
 Item PDCL2 - the status should be PDT2:M
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix this
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P111 L14 # 114
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ
 Item DLLC - the status should be PDT2:M
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix this
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P114 L31 # 117
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ
 Item PSE24, PSE25, PSE26 and PSE27 use just "classification" to describe physical layer classification
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change classification to "physical layer classification"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

PSE24 is generic with respect to 1-Event Physical Layer classification, 2-Event Physical Layer classificaion, and Data Link Layer Classification. No change needed.
 PSE25, PSE26, and PSE27 should have "classification" changed to "Physical Layer classification."

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P114 L32 # 265
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Value/Comment Field: missing the '1' for 'Type 1 PSE'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the '1'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P116 L33 # 277
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Equation number in 33.2.9.5, page 62, line 25 has changed from draft 3.0.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change equation number in the Value/Comment field for PICS PSE62 to 33-3.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P116 L40 # 279
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Figure number has changed in the text, 33.2.9.8, page 64, figure 33-15. PICS PSE64 requires an update
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change figure number in PICS PSE64 to 33-15.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P116 L40 # 278
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Equation number has changed to 33-5 for IPSEUT in 33.2.9.8
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update equation number in PICS PSE64 to 33-5.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Editor to research why these references did not auto-update.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P119 L27 # 292
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 PICS PD24 is specific to Type 2 PDs therefore the Status field needs to indicate as such.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 'Status' field from 'M' to 'PDT2:M'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P119 L7 # 289
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Table reference in PICS PD18 is incorrect. Tables were renumbered.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change table reference to 33-17 in Value/Comment field.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.2 P120 L12 # 296
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 PICS PD36 and PD37, equations were renumbered in the text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 33-8 on line 12 to 33-9 Change 33-9 on line 14 to 33-10
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.5 P123 L36 # 303
 Nadeau, Gerard
 Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ
 Equation and equation number have changed in the text, 33.4.9.2, page 91, line 23. PICS PSEEL13 requires an update.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace PICS PSEEL13 Value/Comment field as follows: 'Exceed transfer function gain expressed in equation 33-19 from 0.1 MHz to 1 MHz at the pins of the PI used as 100BASE-TX transmit pins'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.5 P123 L41 # 304
Nadeau, Gerard

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Text and subclause reference 33.4.9.2.1, page 91, line 29 has changed from D3.0 (33.4.9.2). PICS PSEEL14 needs to be updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace existing PSEEL14 fields as follows: Subclause: 33.4.9.2.1 Status: MIDA:M

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.7 P124 L2 # 308
Nadeau, Gerard

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Subclauses 33.8.3.7 and 33.8.3.8 are not in sequence with the rest of the PICS in relation to the clause numbers they reference (33.7...). Suggest they be moved to follow 33.8.3.10 which reference 33.6... and renumber the clauses as necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 33.8.3.7 and 33.8.3.8 in order after 33.8.3.10 and renumber. 33.8.3.9 becomes 33.8.3.7 Management function requirements 33.8.3.10 becomes 33.8.3.8 Data Link Layer classification requirements 33.8.3.7 becomes 33.8.3.9 Environmental spec... to PSEs and PDs 33.8.3.8 becomes 33.8.3.10 Environmental spec... to the PSE

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move 33.8.3.7 and 33.8.3.8 in order after 33.8.3.10 and renumber as appropriate.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.9 P125 L41 # 309
Nadeau, Gerard

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Subclause 33.5.1.2.1 now reserves 2 bits instead of 1 bit (change from D3.0 to D3.3). Need to update PICS MF20.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the 'Feature' to read: 'Reserved bits (12.15:14)'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.8.3.9 P126 L15 # 310
Nadeau, Gerard

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Subclause reference is incorrect and the state name is not quite correct. Update.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the fields in MF27 as follows. Subclause: 33.5.1.2.6 Value/Comment: Replace ERROR_DELAY with ERROR_DELAY_SHORT

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33A SC 33A.1 P131 L26 # 360
McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Missing word "a"

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "... which is a function of the ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33A SC 33A.1 P131 L42 # 361
McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Missing comma

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "... at short cable length, or by presenting ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D4.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33A SC 33A.2 P133 L41 # 362

McCormack, Meghan

Comment Type G Comment Status D EZ

Superfluous comma and missing "and"

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "Because of this, measuring the PD input impedance is a complicated task and the following guidelines should be followed by the PD vendor:"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.