

| Thread Links                |                             |                              | Date Links                |                           |                            |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| <a href="#">Thread Prev</a> | <a href="#">Thread Next</a> | <a href="#">Thread Index</a> | <a href="#">Date Prev</a> | <a href="#">Date Next</a> | <a href="#">Date Index</a> |

## RE: Signal vs. Idle debate

---

- To: [stds-802-3-pwrviandi@xxxxxxx](mailto:stds-802-3-pwrviandi@xxxxxxx)
  - Subject: RE: Signal vs. Idle debate
  - From: "Larry Miller" <[ldmiller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ldmiller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - Date: Mon, 08 May 2000 08:01:12 -0700
  - Sender: [owner-stds-802-3-pwrviandi@xxxxxxx](mailto:owner-stds-802-3-pwrviandi@xxxxxxx)
- 

(I sent this out last week but it didn't seem to make it into the reflector. Try #2:)

Paul Yew and others,

There are a number of Committee members that are concerned about (and, indeed, have serious reservations about) the probable side effects of superimposing comparatively high current DC on the signaling pairs. To date we have had no systematic demonstration by Cisco or anyone else that this arrangement is benign, and one of the charter items for the Committee is that the DC powering scheme chosen "shall not degrade the transmission environment".

And, as it happens, Cisco apparently did not choose to adopt some of the isolation requirements that the Committee reaffirmed from existing 802.3 standards.

So it isn't quite such an opened-and-closed book situation as the marketing hype would have you believe. And the onus is on Cisco to provide enough information to make their case, the "trust us" statements appearing here notwithstanding.

At the March meeting Cisco asked the question "what do we have to do to convince the Committee?". I have posted an answer to this at the IEEE 802.3af public web site:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/af/public/mar00/index.html>

It is titled "Recommended quantitative measurements of the parameters" and is comprised of extracts from IEEE 802.3 and ANSI TP-PMD specifications. These are the "numbers" that we all test our products against (hopefully) and constitute the criteria for which ANY scheme (not just Cisco's) will have to pass muster, in addition to the special requirements set forth by the Committee.

I am sure that most of the Committee members are familiar with these criteria, particularly in view of the fact that many of the members participated in the standards committees that drew up these requirements in the first place.

A solid presentation of measurements of these parameters in an actual operating system (with margins, not just PASS or FAIL results) would do a lot to give the Committee sufficient information to evaluate the viability of the Cisco design or any other that is proposed.

(Comments on the requirements list are welcome)

Regards,

Larry Miller

---

- Prev by Date: [RE: Signal vs. Idle debate \(was: Here's a new idea\)](#)

Prev by thread: [Use of the DTE Power Reflector](#)

• Next by thread: [Remove my name](#)

• Index(es):

◦ [Date](#)

◦ [Thread](#)