

IEEE P802.3cr D1.1 Maintenance #14: Isolation 2nd Task Force review comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P**8** L**19** # **9**
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Jonathan Goldberg no longer the PM - Jodi Haasz is?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Jodi Haasz
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **8** SC **8** P**24** L**4** # **10**
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Can't come up with anything better than Physical Layer MDI/PI. Suggest we use that.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change 'station' to 'Physical Layer MDI/PI'
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Make commentors suggestion and remove editor's note.

CI **8** SC **8.3.2.1** P**24** L**18** # **3**
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 isolation requirement (needs to be plural)
 SuggestedRemedy
 isolation requirements
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **8** SC **8.8.6.11** P**26** L**11** # **5**
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 In most, if not all PICS, it seems, that in "Conforms to Annex J", "Annex J" is a little larger font size than the rest of the text (likely as "Annex J" is a link, the settings for the link is having the wrong font size.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct font size of "Annex J" links in PICS throughout the document.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **14** SC **14.7.1** P**30** L**39** # **11**
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 the note suggests to replace MAU with Physical Layer MDI/PI. Yet in line 13 we have this text: "A MAU with a MDI that is a PI (see 33.1.3) shall meet the isolation requirements defined in 33.4.1." seems clear that the reader will understand that an MAU has an MDI that might be a PI and therefore the safety requirements would apply accordingly.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete the note with no change.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **23** SC **23.9.1** P**34** L**38** # **4**
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Added NOTE is not underlined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Underline Note.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.1 Maintenance #14: Isolation 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 145 SC 145.7.3.7 P104 L1 # 12
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 extraneous blank page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete the page.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 146 SC 146 P105 L14 # 7
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Clause 146 was by ...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clause 146 was added by ... (add "added") in editorial note. Do the same for the editorial note on page 107 (Clasue 147) and page 109 (Clause 149).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 146 SC 146.9.1 P105 L14 # 15
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 the editors note is missing a verb in the first sentence. Clause 146 was ADDED by IEEE P802.3cg...
 SuggestedRemedy
 add the word 'added'.
 Also, in 147 pg 107 ln 14 and in 149 pg 109 ln 20
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Duplicate of comment #7.

CI 146 SC 146.9.1 P106 L1 # 13
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 extraneous blank page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete the page.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 147 SC 147.10.1 P108 L1 # 14
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 extraneous blank page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete the page.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI J SC J P111 L27 # 8
 Jones, Chad Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 D1.0 comment 10 directed to remove 'requirements' from the title of J.2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change title of J.2 from: "General safety requirements" to: "General safety"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cr D1.1 Maintenance #14: Isolation 2nd Task Force review comments

<i>Cl</i> J	<i>SC</i> J.1	<i>P</i> 94	<i>L</i> 17	# 2
Stewart, Heath		Analog Devices		
<i>Comment Type</i>	T	<i>Comment Status</i> X		
IEC 62368-1:2018 Table 26 is titled _Test voltages for electric strength tests based on the peak of the working voltages and recurring peak voltages_. For the 1.5kV row two options are available: 1) Basic or supplementary insulation; 2) Reinforced insulation. The basic/supplementary value is 1.95kV while the reinforced value is 2.4kV. Annex J of 802.3 is referencing the reinforced 2.4kV value. Is this as intended?				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
TFTD				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
TFTD				

<i>Cl</i> J	<i>SC</i> J.1	<i>P</i> 94	<i>L</i> 21	# 1
Stewart, Heath		Analog Devices		
<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i> D		
There appears to be an incorrect reference number. Propose change 5.2.9.1 to 5.4.9.1. 5.2.9.1 does not exist (nor does 5.2.9 for that matter.) 5.4.9.1 is _Test procedure for type testing of solid insulation_.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change				
There shall be no insulation breakdown, as defined in Section 5.2.9.1 of IEC 62368-1:2018 to				
There shall be no insulation breakdown, as defined in Section 5.4.9.1 of IEC 62368-1:2018				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

<i>Cl</i> J	<i>SC</i> J.3.1	<i>P</i> 112	<i>L</i> 10	# 6
Graber, Steffen		Pepperl+Fuchs AG		
<i>Comment Type</i>	E	<i>Comment Status</i> D		<i>EZ</i>
... listed in J.1				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change to "... listed in Annex J.1" and correct font size.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				