

# TCP YANG Model – Update

**Michael Scharf**

Mahesh Jethanandani

Vishal Murgai

TCPM @ IETF 112

# Changes -02 to -03

- Emphasis of narrow scope in abstract and introduction
- Explanation why TCP connection table is modeled as writable due to YANG semantics requirements
  - “TCP connection table: Access to status information for all TCP connections. Note, the connection table is modeled as a list that is read-writable, even though a connection cannot be created by adding entries to the table. Similarly, deletion of connections from this list is implementation-specific.”
- Detailed security considerations for writable configuration

# Changes -03 to -04

- First set of review comments by Tom Petch (thanks!)
  - 793bis instead of RFC 793 as base reference for TCP
  - URI for TCPM WG in YANG model updated: [datatracker.ietf.org](http://datatracker.ietf.org) instead of [tools.ietf.org](http://tools.ietf.org)
  - Bugfix in IANA considerations: Only one entry in XML Registry
  - Some further minor improvements
- Second set of review comments by Tom Petch planned for -05 (see next slide)

# Upcoming changes in -05

- Minor improvement of references
  - Normative references for all YANG imports
  - Informative reference to draft-ietf-i2nsf-capability-data-model
  - Reference to 793bis for all statistics
  - Reference to RFC 8792 for line wrap convention
- Various further smaller changes
  - Warning signs regarding MD5 also in YANG model and Security Consideration
  - “0..255” could be “0..max” in YANG model
  - YANG “action” with a NACM default deny-all
  - Improvements for examples (use of documentation IP addresses, IPv6 example)
- TBD: Add reference to TCP-AO configuration in draft-ietf-opsawg-l3sm-l3nm
  - l3nm only models a subset of TCP-AO parameters (like for many other IETF models)
  - l3nm assumes additions to the key-chain in RFC 8177 for TCP-AO send-id and recv-id
  - **Suggestion: Reference l3nm document and briefly describe the differences**
- TBD: Comprehensive comparison with TCP-MIB in RFC 4022
  - Document already briefly summarizes similarities and differences to TCP-MIB
  - Past WG feedback against full compatibility or feature parity with TCP-MIB
  - **Question: Add a new appendix to summarize the differences???**

# Next steps

- Upcoming -05 should address all known issues
- Any further comments?
- **Ready for WGLC?**