(1) What type of RFC is being requested (BCP, Proposed Standard, Internet Standard, Informational, Experimental, or Historic)? Why is this the proper type of RFC? Is this type of RFC indicated in the title page header?

The Intended Status is 'Proposed Standard'.

The type of RFC is properly indicated in the title page header.

This document describes the Logical Network Element (LNE) YANG data model: creation of logical network elements on a network device, and allocating host resources to a given LNE.

(2) The IESG approval announcement includes a Document Announcement Write-Up. Please provide such a Document Announcement Write-Up. Recent examples can be found in the "Action" announcements for approved documents. The approval announcement contains the following sections:

Technical Summary

 This document describes a YANG data model for Logical Network Elements (LNEs).

A network device may divide its resources into logical network elements (LNEs), each of which provides a managed logical device. The module defined in this document is used to support multiple LNEs on a single physical or virtual system, create LNEs and allocate host resource to a given LNE.

Working Group Summary

This draft has been thoroughly discussed in the WG.

The draft adoption and progress has received full support from the WG.

All major comments have been addressed. The draft is ready for publication.

Minor editorial comments are sent in a separate document.

Document Quality

The draft went through initial reviews by YANG-Doctors and the quality is good.

A subset of the proposed model has been implemented. (are there any know implementations?)

Personnel

Yingzhen Qu is the Document Shepherd.

Alia Atlas is the Responsible Area Director.

(3) Briefly describe the review of this document that was performed by the Document Shepherd. If this version of the document is not ready for publication, please explain why the document is being forwarded to the IESG.

 The draft has been thoroughly reviewed by the Shepherd.

Minor editorial comments are sent in a separate document.

(4) Does the document Shepherd have any concerns about the depth or breadth of the reviews that have been performed?

 No concerns.

(5) Do portions of the document need review from a particular or from broader perspective, e.g., security, operational complexity, AAA, DNS, DHCP, XML, or internationalization? If so, describe the review that took place.

The draft has been reviewed by Routing Directorate QA and YANG Doctors.

(6) Describe any specific concerns or issues that the Document Shepherd has with this document that the Responsible Area Director and/or the IESG should be aware of? For example, perhaps he or she is uncomfortable with certain parts of the document, or has concerns whether there really is a need for it. In any event, if the WG has discussed those issues and has indicated that it still wishes to advance the document, detail those concerns here.

 N/A

(7) Has each author confirmed that any and all appropriate IPR disclosures required for full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79 have already been filed. If not, explain why.

 Yes. Every author has confirmed.

(8) Has an IPR disclosure been filed that references this document?

If so, summarize any WG discussion and conclusion regarding the IPR disclosures.

Yes. The authors have been asked (and they answered) on the WG list about IPR at every step of the process. There haven't been any concerns raised on the list.

(9) How solid is the WG consensus behind this document? Does it represent the strong concurrence of a few individuals, with others being silent, or does the WG as a whole understand and agree with it?

The draft adoption and progress had received full support from the WG.

(10) Has anyone threatened an appeal or otherwise indicated extreme discontent? If so, please summarize the areas of conflict in separate email messages to the Responsible Area Director. (It should be in a separate email because this questionnaire is publicly available.)

No.

(11) Identify any ID nits the Document Shepherd has found in this document. (See <http://www.ietf.org/tools/idnits/> and the Internet-Drafts Checklist). Boilerplate checks are not enough; this check needs to be thorough.

There are still some editorial comments that need to be addressed.

From idnits:

 Checking references for intended status: Proposed Standard

 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------

 (See RFCs 3967 and 4897 for information about using normative references

 to lower-maturity documents in RFCs)

 == Outdated reference: A later version (-08) exists of

 draft-ietf-netmod-schema-mount-06

 == Outdated reference: A later version (-02) exists of

 draft-ietf-netmod-yang-tree-diagrams-01

 == Outdated reference: A later version (-04) exists of

 draft-ietf-rtgwg-ni-model-03

 Summary: 0 errors (\*\*), 0 flaws (~~), 3 warnings (==), 1 comment (--).

 (12) Describe how the document meets any required formal review criteria, such as the MIB Doctor, media type, and URI type reviews.

YANG Doctors review comments have been addressed.

(13) Have all references within this document been identified as either normative or informative?

 Yes

(14) Are there normative references to documents that are not ready for advancement or are otherwise in an unclear state? If such normative references exist, what is the plan for their completion?

No.

(15) Are there downward normative references references (see RFC 3967)? If so, list these downward references to support the Area Director in the Last Call procedure.

No.

(16) Will publication of this document change the status of any existing RFCs? Are those RFCs listed on the title page header, listed in the abstract, and discussed in the introduction? If the RFCs are not listed in the Abstract and Introduction, explain why, and point to the part of the document where the relationship of this document to the other RFCs is discussed. If this information is not in the document, explain why the WG considers it unnecessary.

The state of other documents remains unchanged.

(17) Describe the Document Shepherd's review of the IANA considerations section, especially with regard to its consistency with the body of the document. Confirm that all protocol extensions that the document makes are associated with the appropriate reservations in IANA registries.

Confirm that any referenced IANA registries have been clearly identified. Confirm that newly created IANA registries include a detailed specification of the initial contents for the registry, that allocations procedures for future registrations are defined, and a reasonable name for the new registry has been suggested (see RFC 5226).

This draft registers a URI in the IETF XML registry and a YANG module in the YANG Module Names registry.

(18) List any new IANA registries that require Expert Review for future allocations. Provide any public guidance that the IESG would find useful in selecting the IANA Experts for these new registries.

N/A

(19) Describe reviews and automated checks performed by the Document Shepherd to validate sections of the document written in a formal language, such as XML code, BNF rules, MIB definitions, etc.

The draft (version-02) has been reviewed by YANG-Doctors, all the comments received have been properly addressed.