IEEE P802.3bt Unsatisfied Comments 4P-PoE 4th Working Group recirculation ballot comments

---

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.4**   *P* **222**   *L* **20**   # 20069
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *LLDP*

Does "should" here mean it is only a recommendation? Is it OK to have more than one?

Also applies to 79.3.2.7, although it is in the base document.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "shall" unless there is no problem with having more than one.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No change to the draft.

Having more than one is allowed but may lead to ambiguous situations therefore, it is discouraged.

Cl **33A**   *SC* **33A.3**   *P* **233**   *L* **16**   # 20071
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Annex*

Seems like a normative requirement in an informative annex. Also in other subclauses of 33A.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this annex normative?

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

These are cabling requirements and this annex was written in a way to not include normative requirements (no shalls).

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8.3**   *P* **159**   *L* **24**   # 24126
Picard, Jean   Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Pres: Darshan15*

The following sentence does not make sense. In reality the PSE cannot really short the PI voltage, all it can do is temporarily turn off its port (it's only a low side switch after all, with a 0.1uF cap).

"The minimum PD input capacitance CPort min or CPort-2P min defined in Table 145-28, allows a PD to operate for input voltage transients which cause VPD to drop as low as 0 V, lasting less than 30 µs as specified in 145.3.8.6."

SuggestedRemedy

Use similar wording to the "at" standard, removing "which cause VPD to drop as low as 0 V".
The wording becomes this:

"The minimum PD input capacitance CPort min or CPort-2P min defined in Table 145-28, allows a PD to operate for input voltage transients lasting less than 30 µs as specified in 145.3.8.6"

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

Out of scope.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.8.6**   *P* **198**   *L* **24**   # 24127
Picard, Jean   Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *PD Power*

"A PD shall continue to operate without interruption in the presence of transients at the PSE PI as defined in 145.2.8.3."

This sentence does not make sense, since it refers to a transient to 0V at the PI. In reality the PSE cannot really short the PI voltage, all it can do is temporarily turn off its port (it's only a low side switch after all, with a 0.1uF cap).
Also, if the voltage at the PI goes down to 0V or not at PSE PI is purely dependent on the PD configuration (load current, type of input bridge, etc), and should not be part of the requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with:
"A PD shall continue to operate without interruption while there is loss of power at PSE PI for up to 30 µs"

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

Out of scope

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **24127**   Page 1 of 2
7/13/2017 9:15:59 AM

IEEE P802.3bt Unsatisfied Comments 4P-PoE 4th Working Group recirculation ballot comments

---

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8.5.1**   *P* **163**   *L* **45**   # 24198
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Pres: Darshan12*

Current text in P802.3bt/D2.4: ICon-2P-unb and Equation (145-15) are specified for total channel common mode pair resistance RChan-2P from 0.2 O to 12.5 O and worst case unbalance contribution by a PD.   (I don't understand what "total channel common mode pair resistance" is in this context. What are the measurement end points for this "total channel" and what is the relevance to the specification at hand? We have no control of "total channel common mode pair resistance" other than by the independent specification of each of the 3 elements, PSE, Link Section and PD. Derivations of how we came to the values of each have no place in the specifications of each of the two separate devices.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed text for P802.3bt/D2.5: If we are to include these derivations they should be in an informative annex.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

No remedy supplied

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8.5.1**   *P* **164**   *L* **17**   # 24201
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Pres: Darshan12*

Current text in P802.3bt/D2.4: "End-to-end pair-to-pair resistance" The "ends" as used in this evaluation are not defined, not defined as being accessible and under normal circumstances don't even come from the same vendor. Therefore I don't have a clue how to do this "evaluation"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed text for P802.3bt/D2.5: ????

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

Out of scope and no remedy proposed.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **24201**

Page 2 of 2
7/13/2017 9:15:59 AM