

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P**7** L**13** # **1**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

"FirstName SecondName, IEEE P802.3xx Task Force name Task Force Editor-in-Chief" - I guess you're Chief Editor as well>

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Jon Lewis, IEEE P802.3cr Maintenance #14: Isolation Task Force Editor-in-Chief"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **1** SC **1** P**21** L**1** # **2**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

It seems you will not need Clause 1 at all

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Clause 1 from draft

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **9** SC **9.0.3** P**24** L**6** # **3**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Wrong L2 header number. The same issue on page 27 line 7

SuggestedRemedy

"0" should be replaced with the right number

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor is not able to find the specified header number on 24/6: TFTD

Change "9.0.3 FOMAU electrical characteristics"

to:

"9.9.3 FOMAU electrical characteristics"

and renumber remaining sub-clauses in that section.

CI **9** SC **9.0.3.1** P**24** L**13** # **4**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Missing "." after "Annex J"

The same issue on page 27, line 15; page 28, line 15; page 33, line 17; page 33, line 41; page 37, line 14; page 38, line 17; page 38, line 40; page 47, line 14

SuggestedRemedy

Add missing "."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

add missing "." after Annex J in the following locations:
page 26, line 13; page 27, line 15; page 28, line 15; page 33, line 17; page 33, line 41; page 37, line 14; page 38, line 17; page 38, line 40; page 47, line 14

CI **9** SC **9.0.3.1** P**24** L**12** # **5**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**

Text of the note should not mention .3cr, since this designation will be gone. Alsok discussion on "considerations for the latest safety standards should be made for any new design or installation" sounds very loose and completely unnecessary - it is sufficient to point out no more maintaince is being made, and that all security consdierations are covered Annex J. Period.

The same issue on page 27, line 14; page 28, line 14; page 33, line 15; page 33, line 39; page 37, line 12; page 38, line 14; page 38, line 38; page 47, line 12

SuggestedRemedy

Use the following text "Since September 2011, maintenance changes are no longer being considered for this Clause. Safety information may be found in Annex J."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

CI 23 SC 23.9.4.12 P34 L20 # 6

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Previous updates to PICS used "Conforms to Annex J" wording - any reason why you use jus Annex J reference in here?

SuggestedRemedy

In ISO2, 3, 4 use "Conforms to Annex J" instead

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.1 P39 L40 # 7

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Any reason for highlight on "IEC 60950-1."
Same on page 40, line 47

SuggestedRemedy

Remove highlight

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss with comment #21

CI 38 SC 38.12.4.1 P42 L15 # 8

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change the editorial instructions to include "(uncanges rows are not shown)" and show only rows needing changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment. Consider making this change for all PICS where tables contain a lot of unchanged rows (they do not need to be shown)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD - unchanged lines were added due to a prior comment from the Plenary meeting.

CI A SC A P93 L1 # 9

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Annex A is not needed

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI J SC J P94 L7 # 10

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Annex J is without a title.

SuggestedRemedy

Please put a correct title for Annex J

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify Title as follows:

"Annex J: Safety and Electrical Isolation"

TFTD

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 11

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There are several projects in flight, including .3ca, which include safety statements. Are there any plans to comment on these projects and make sure that the proper safety statements are included?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider commenting against (e.g., .3ca) to make sure proper referenced to Annex J are beir made.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Based on the outcome of this meeting the Chair will submit comments on the in-flight projects that will likely publish after P802.3cr. For those that will publish prior to P802.3cr the Editor w include those in the D1.1.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

Cl J SC J.1 P94 L15 # 12

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

New reference: IEC 62368-1:2018

SuggestedRemedy

add missing reference to Clause 1?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The suggested reference is being added by P802.3cg. However, this indicates ISO/IEC 62368-1:2014 when it really should indicate the 2018 version. TFTD

Likely should bring this reference into D1.1 and modify to indicate the 2018 version.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P22 L1 # 13

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

There are no new definitions or abbreviations.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete page 22

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 8 SC 8.8.6.8 P24 L13 # 14

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The original text has been changed, PICS entry 1 needs to be modified accordingly.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Value/comment to: "Conforms to Annex J".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 14 SC 14.10.4.5.11 P30 L4 # 15

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Parameter and reference (first column) are needed for a PICS entry.

SuggestedRemedy

Keep IR1a and change Parameter to "Electrical isolation".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 14 SC 14.10.4.5.11 P30 L14 # 16

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

As the isolation resistance is removed in the original text (is now in Annex J), IR2 needs to be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove IR2 PICS entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 15 SC 15.8.6.4 P32 L16 # 17

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

As the isolation resistance is removed in the original text (is now in Annex J), IR2 needs to be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove IR2 PICS entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Duplicate of comment #16

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 23 SC 23.9.4.12 P34 L13 # 18

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The original text of Clause 23 is not changed, so ISO2, ISO3 and ISO4 need to be kept.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove changes applied to 23.9.4.12.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 23 SC 23.9.4.16 P34 L35 # 19

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The original text of Clause 23 is not changed, so SAF1 entry needs to be kept in the original way.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove changes applied to 23.9.4.16.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 27 SC 27.5.4.11 P37 L26 # 20

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The original text of Clause 27 is not changed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove changes applied to EL2 entry in 27.5.4.11.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.1 P39 L39 # 21

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type T Comment Status D

IEC 60950-1 cannot be referenced anymore.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace IEC 60950-1 by "... in accordance with PELV/SELV requirements." and modify PICS accordingly. Needs to be discussed with the group.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD highlighted text.

Cl 38 SC 38.12.4.1 P44 L14 # 22

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Conforms to Annex J" needs to be in teh Value/Comment field.

SuggestedRemedy

Move "Conforms to Annex J" to the Value/Comment field and add "Electrical Isolation" to the Feature field.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 40 SC 40.12.7 P46 L16 # 23

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The original clause text did not change for the requirement in PME2.

SuggestedRemedy

Add PME2 again.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 113 SC 113.12.10 P90 L12 # 24

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

PICS for 113.5.1 is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Add: " ENVa, Isolation Requirements, 113.5.1, M, Yes [], Conforms to Annex J"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Bring in Table from 113.12.6 which has PME1 and PME2 for 113.5.1. Modify according to Annex J.

Cl 126 SC 126.12.1 P92 L12 # 25

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

PICS for 126.5.1 is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Add: " ENVa, Isolation Requirements, 126.5.1, M, Yes [], Conforms to Annex J"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Bring 126.12.5 into the draft and modify PME1 and PME2 to indicate Annex J.

Cl A SC A P93 L1 # 26

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

There is no new information for Annex A.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove page 93.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accomodated by comment #9

Cl J SC J.3.2 P95 L19 # 27

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Needs to be "IEC" instead of "EC".

SuggestedRemedy

IEC 62368-1:2018

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 23 SC 23.9.4.12 P34 L23 # 28

Jones, Chad

Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

simply says 'Annex J' in the value/comment field.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'Conforms to Annex J' on lines 23, 25, and 36.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modified by comment #5

Cl 113 SC 113.12.10 P90 L13 # 29

Jones, Chad

Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

simply says 'Annex J' in the value/comment field.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'Conforms to Annex J'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 126 SC 126.12.1 P92 L13 # 30

Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 simply says 'Annex J' in the value/comment field.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to 'Conforms to Annex J'

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl J SC J.1 P94 L17 # 31

Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "not less than 1 s" - is "greater than 1s" a better way to write thiw?

SuggestedRemedy
 change "not less than 1 s" to "greater than 1 s"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Text is unchanged from previous text.

TFTD

Cl 00 SC 0 P1 L23 # 32

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 "The" is misspelled.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Tthe" to "The"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P9 L14 # 33

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The term "Ethernet" in this context is incorrect. The 1985 standard did not use the term Ethernet in the title or in the body of the standard. What was published was actually not Ethernet but was interoperable with Ethernet.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Ethernet" here with the actual title of the 1985 standard.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The introduction is not part of IEEE Std 802.3cr-20xx.

TFTD

Cl 8 SC 8.3.2.1 P23 L13 # 34

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Improve technical clarity of text.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text of the 1st sentence to read: The MAU must provide isolation between any conductor of the AUI cable and any conductor of the coaxial trunk cable.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TFTD: That text was unchanged from IEEE Std 802.3-2018

Cl 9 SC 9.0.3.1 P26 L12 # 35

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing comma

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text: "Given this IEEE" to read: "Given this, IEEE"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Text has been removed by Comment #5.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.0 Maintenance #14: Isolation 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 9 SC 9.0.3.1 P26 L14 # 36

Thompson, Geoff

GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Imposing these new requirements on "new installations" that don't use newly designed equipment is unrealistic, particularly since most of the isolation of a repeater comes from the transceivers, not the repeater unit.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the words "or installation"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Text removed by Comment #5

Cl 8 SC 8.7.1 P23 L36 # 38

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco,

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"All stations meeting this standard shall conform to the general safety requirements as specified in Annex

J." these clauses in IEEE 802.3 specify ports, not stations or equipment. The electrical isolation requirements will apply to the MAU, or PMA/PMD/MDI. However, the stations or equipment may have multiple functions, ports, and power connections on it that have nothing to do with 802.3 or any LAN/MAN networking functions, and compliance with 62368 is dependent on those functions too. The requirement really is that the Clause xx MAU (or whatever clause PMA, PMD, etc.) shall not preclude the equipment complying with 62368; however, I can't figure out how to say that in a testable way. The best I know is to state the expectation for the equipment so the designer is aware, which now is in Annex J, and to remove the reference to the equipment in the individual clauses, so electrical isolation applies to the MAU, PMA/PMD/MDI, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

In clause 8.7.1 change "All stations" to "The MAU". And similarly in clause 14.7.1 change "All equipment" to "The MAU", and so on for the other PHY clauses.

In Annex J, J.2, page 94 line 28, change "All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to IEC 62368-1:2018." to "Equipment meeting this standard is expected to conform to IEC 62368-1:2018."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD