### Approved Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Yseboodt, Lennart</th>
<th>Philips Lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>P26</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>#253</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The rotated pages are an annoyance, especially in print and as such should be avoided when possible.

For the mapping table there does not seem to be a need to flip the page. The text in the "Container(s)" column data can easily be split over multiple lines (it is mostly empty space now) and this column made less wide. This allows these pages to be oriented in the portrait fashion.

**Suggested Remedy**

- Decrease width of "Container(s)" column and make pages portrait.

**Response**  **Response Status** U

REJECT.

Current structure optimizes readability. Initial draft versions had portrait page layout and received a lot of comments on problems with readability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Yseboodt, Lennart</th>
<th>Philips Lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>P29</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>#254</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The document provides a URL to a github repository for the machine readable version of the YANG models and states that in case of a discrepancy these prevail over the version included in the PDF.

This is clear and seems correct to me.

I however question the value of including a printed dump of these YANG models in the standard. It will be maintenance intensive to keep these two in sync.

**Suggested Remedy**

- Task force to consider NOT including the Yang models in the draft in full, but rather focus on requirements and descriptive text. Possible show some core objects or show a few examples.

**Response**  **Response Status** U

REJECT.

The published 802.3 standards are intended to be self contained, i.e., any external content is for ease of importing machine readable documents, and not required for proper understanding of the draft.

The same document structure was also used for IEEE Std 802.3.1

---

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** R

Would it be useful to define rpcs to reset those interface stats?

**Suggested Remedy**

- Add RPCs to reset interface stats

**Response**  **Response Status** U

REJECT.

No specific proposal provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Cheng, Weiying</th>
<th>Coriant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5.2</td>
<td>P67</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>#259</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

There is no need to use landscape page orientation for these Yang models.

**Suggested Remedy**

- Reduce font size such that the text fits on a portrait page without excessive line wrapping.

**Response**  **Response Status** U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

- Portrait mode will be attempted and used only if the module text fits without overflow.

---

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** R

Is any reason to comment PRC out and remove them in future? Reset stats is a useful for operator so suggest to keep this function.

**Suggested Remedy**

- keep RPCs for reset stats

**Response**  **Response Status** U

REJECT.

The TF has decided NOT to include RPCs.