Cl **1** *SC* **105.3** *P* **37** *L* **25** # 369

Grow, Robert   RMG Consluting

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

If 25GBASE-T1 deserves its own protocol stack in Figure 105-1, then it should describe those sublayers in the relevant 105.3.x subclauses. I missed this and should have voted no on advancement to WG ballot as the draft is not technically complete. I should have seen these titles with no associated changes as an indication of incompleteness.

SuggestedRemedy

The technical experts in the TF are much better qualified than I am to provide the missing text for the 25GBASE-T1 protocol stack relevant sections. Delete the subclause titles not relevant to the 25GBASE-T1 protocol stack. Include editorial instructions for each of the remaining subclauses.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove 105.3.1 through 105.3.5

Cl **165** *SC* **165.1.3.1** *P* **42** *L* **35** # 340

Gorshe, Steve   Microchip Technology

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

The phrase "RS-FEC (936, 846, 2^10)" appears to be the incorrect format. This implies that the FEC symbol size is 2^10 = 1024 bits. It appears that it should be "RS-FEC (936, 846, 10)" using the 10-bit symbol size of KR-4 and KP-4 FEC codes

SuggestedRemedy

If the comment is correct, this should be changed to RS-FEC (936, 846, 10)

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

=====

replace "(936,846,2^10)" with "(936,846) over GF(2^10)"

Cl **165** *SC* **165.3.2.2** *P* **56** *L* **41** # 341

Gorshe, Steve   Microchip Technology

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

Here and other places, the term "9360-bit (936, 846) RS-FEC frames" is used. This terminology is incorrect or at least inconsistent with typical terminology. The 9360-bit entity is actually an FEC codeword. An FEC frame consists of multiple FEC codewords.

SuggestedRemedy

In all instances where the 9360-bit block is referred to as an FEC "frame" the term should be changed to FEC "codeword".

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The proposed text is inconsistent with the terminology alignment per comment #710. No changes needed.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Cl* **165** Page 1 of 1
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **165.3.2.2** 8/30/2022 1:50:38 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line