Revision Letter

I2NSF Registration Interface YANG Data Model

(Old Draft Name: draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-05 and New Draft Name: draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-06)

Sangwon Hyun and Jaehoon Paul Jeong

Date: 1/21/2020

Dear Reshad,

Here are our responses to your comments below. Our answer starts from [Sangwon] with blue color.

Reviewer: Reshad Rahman

YANG Doctor review of draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-05 (by Reshad Rahman)

Dear Reshad Rahman,

Thanks for your constructive comments.

My answer for your individual question or comment starts with “=> [Sangwon].”

Major comments:

- There is a YANG warning on the datatracker page:

ietf-i2nsf-reg-interface@2019-07-24.yang:54: warning: RFC 8407: 3.1: The IETF Trust Copyright statement seems to be missing (see pyang --ietf-help for details).

To fix this, in the YANG module remove the <> around 2019: Copyright (c) <2019>

=> [Sangwon] As you suggested, we removed <> from the copyright statement. Now there is no warning.

- For contact in YANG module, please remove WG chair info (see RFC8407 appendix B for an example)

=> [Sangwon] We removed WG chair information from the list of contacts in the YANG module.

- For the revision in YANG module, put "Initial version" (even though it's the 5th revision)

=> [Sangwon] We put “Initial revision” instead of “the 5th revision.”

- Why define a union of ipv4-address and ipv6-address in typedef nsf-address, why not reuse existing ip-address type from RFC6021?

=> [Sangwon] As you suggested, we revised our YANG module to reuse the existing inet:ip-address.

- For bandwidth, is there a reason why it's limited to uint16? Even though 65Tbps is a lot, I wouldn't limit it to uint16. And aren't there any use-cases for bandwidth smaller than 1 Gbps? If yes, use e.g Mbps as unit and use uint32 instead of uint16? Please use units statement.

=> [Sangwon] As you suggested, we revised our YANG module to use uint32 instead of uint16 and the units statement of Mbps.

- It is not clear to me what's the distinction between nsf-name and nsf-instance-name. In Examples 4 and 5, they have the same value, but not in Example 3. Might be worth clarifying or giving the same name.

=> [Sangwon] As you suggested, we revised Examples 3~5 to have capability-name instead of both nsf-name and nsf-instance-name because both nsf-name and nsf-instance-name specify the name of the NSF capability.

- Having nsf or i2nsf in many node names is redundant, since NSF or I2NSF is in the higher level container name. e.g, in NSF Capability Registration all nodes seem to have i2nsf or nsf in their name.

=> [Sangwon] We changed the node names to reduce the redundancy between them. We also revised the whole document according to the changes of the node names.

- There seems to be some indentation issues in the YANG module (e.g. P16)

=> [Sangwon] We carefully doublechecked the indentations and corrected the indentation issues.

- Abide by order in RFC8407 Appendix B. e.g. RPC statements should be after groupings.

=> [Sangwon] We revised our YANG module in order to abide by order in RFC 8407 Appendix B. The RPC statement was moved after the grouping statements.

Nits:

- Appendix B: Managmenet -> Management

=> [Sangwon] Corrected

- Section 6.2: capailities -> capabilities

=> [Sangwon] Corrected

- Example 5: space in "http_and_h ttps_flood_mitigation_capability"

=> [Sangwon] Corrected

Thanks for your help.

Best Regards,

Sangwon and Paul