

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

CI J SC J.1 P94 L21 # 1 [REDACTED]  
 Stewart, Heath Analog Devices  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **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\_.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI J SC J.1 P94 L17 # 2 [REDACTED]  
 Stewart, Heath Analog Devices  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **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?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TFTD  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 TFTD

CI 8 SC 8.3.2.1 P24 L18 # 3 [REDACTED]  
 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 23 SC 23.9.1 P34 L38 # 4 [REDACTED]  
 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.

CI 8 SC 8.8.6.11 P26 L11 # 5 [REDACTED]  
 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 J SC J.3.1 P112 L10 # 6 [REDACTED]  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs AG  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ  
 ... listed in J.1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "... listed in Annex J.1" and correct font size.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl FM SC FM P8 L19 # 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.

Cl 8 SC 8 P24 L4 # 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.

Cl 14 SC 14.7.1 P30 L39 # 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.

Cl 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.

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

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.