



Report of WGLC of Consumer-Facing Interface and Registration Interface YANG Data Models

[draft-ietf-i2nsf-consumer-facing-interface-dm-21](#)

[draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-19](#)

IETF 114, Philadelphia

July 26, 2022

Jaehoon (Paul) Jeong

pauljeong@skku.edu

Sungkyunkwan University

I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface Status

- I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface (CFI) YANG data model is **well synchronized** with I2NSF Capability and I2NSF NSF-Facing Interface (NFI) YANG data models.
- I2NSF CFI is designed with minimum details, but able to be translated to the corresponding NFI.
- The IPR Declaration on I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface YANG Data Model Draft is updated.
 - The details can be seen at:
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/ipr/5694/>

I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface Reviews

Review by Yang Penglin from China Mobile:

Re: [I2nsf] need more review and support to close the WGLC for draft-ietf-i2nsf-consumer-facing-interface-dm-21
"yangpenglin@chinamobile.com" <yangpenglin@chinamobile.com> | Fri, 22 July 2022 04:43 UTC | [Show header](#)

Hi all,

This updated licensing seems a "defensive" policy, which in my opinion is all right. I also reviewed draft-ietf-i2nsf-consumer-facing-interface-dm-21, and have no objection for WGLC of this draft.

BR.

Penglin

► IPR Declaration cleared this issue.

I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface Reviews

Review by Dr. Jungsoo Park from ETRI:

I reviewed the "I2NSF Consumer Facing Interface YANG Data Model ."
This draft is **well done for moving forward**.

There are some **editorial comments** below:

[Abstract in Page 1]

In here, the "an administrative domain" is used just one time. The definition of "administrative domain" should be provided in appropriate chapter. Or please give the example like I2NSF User group.

[Chapter 3.2 in Page 8]

"VoCN" acronym is used at first.

So, full words should be provided about the "VoCN." and related references should be also described in the reference chapter.

[Chapter 4.4 in Page 14]

"The URLn-Group object SHALL have ~~~~" was described. "URLn-Group" is maybe typo of "URL-Group."

[Chapter 5.1 in Page 15]

I think that "Signatures" should be kept carefully in a secure manner. This draft said that this issue is out of scope. Even though this issue is out of scope, this draft should show the proper references. I think that the DID, blockchain, and etc are good solutions.

[Chapter 12.1 in Page 69]

- xxx-semantics-19.txt >> RFC9110
- xxx-monitoring-data-model-19.txt >> xxx-monitoring-data-model-20.txt
- xxx-rfc4960-bis-19.txt >> RFC9260

► -22 version will reflect these comments.

I2NSF Consumer-Facing Interface Reviews

Review by Charlie Kaufman (Secdir):

The review result I wanted to give was "Mostly Harmless". I am skeptical as to whether the collection of policies specifiable is flexible enough to be usable to manage a real network, but the syntax is easily extensible and this seems as good a place to start as any. If it encourages experimentation with management systems that distribute policies this way, that would be a good thing, and any deficiencies found could be fixed later. I could imagine other groups having very different visions as to how to manage this information, but I would not expect the presence of this document as an RFC would discourage them from experimenting with those visions.

I'm not sufficiently familiar with YANG or with Network Functions Virtualization to have a useful opinion as to how good this design is.

I noticed one nit, which suggests they might want to run the document through a spelling checker. The nit is not worth holding the document up if no one finds anything else.

Nits:

Page 8: interuption -> interruption

► -21 version reflected this comment.

I2NSF Registration Interface Status

- I2NSF Registration Interface YANG data model document mostly follows I2NSF Capability YANG data model.
 - I2NSF Capability YANG data model has been submitted to RFC Editorial for publication.
- The additional information provided in Registration Interface YANG data model:
 - Performance capability (i.e., processing and bandwidth capacity)
 - Access information (i.e., IP address and port number)

I2NSF Registration Interface Reviews

Review by Yang Penglin from China Mobile:

Re: [I2nsf] WGLC for draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-dm-17

"yangpenglin@chinamobile.com" <yangpenglin@chinamobile.com> | Sat, 23 July 2022 07:18 UTC | [Show header](#)

Hi all,

I reviewed draft-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-18 recently. it looks fine to me. I have no objection for WGLC of this draft.

BR.

penglin

I2NSF Registration Interface Reviews

Review by Yunchul Choi from ETRI:

Re: [I2nsf] Request for I2NSF Draft Review

최윤철 <cyc79@etri.re.kr> | Mon, 25 July 2022 13:31 UTC | [Show header](#)

Hi I2NSF WG,

I reviewed the I2NSF Registration Interface YANG Data Model.

This draft is well written and ready to be progressed for publication.

One comment below.

In '4.1.2. NSF access Information' an example of access information is described by including VLAN.

But, in '5 Data Model' NSF access information, it was described only with IP and port.

It would be good to add VLAN as an option in '5 Data Model' NSF access information

► **-19 version reflected this comment.**

In Section 4.1.2, NSF Access Information is clarified as a pair of an IP address and a port number in TCP.

I2NSF Registration Interface Reviews

Review by Scott G. Kelly (Secdir):

`review-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-17-secdir-early-kelly-2022-06-05-00`

From the abstract,

This document defines an information model and a YANG data model for Registration Interface between Security Controller and Developer's Management System (DMS) in the Interface to Network Security Functions (I2NSF) framework to register Network Security Functions (NSF) of the DMS with the Security Controller.

The document contains a well-written security considerations section that describes potential threats and mitigations. I have no experience with YANG, but from a security point of view, I see no issues with this document.

I2NSF Registration Interface Reviews

Review by Gyan Mishra (Opsdir):

review-ietf-i2nsf-registration-interface-dm-17-opsdir-early-mishra-2022-05-25-00

I reviewed the draft and the draft is well written and ready to be progressed for publication.

One comment below.

Appendix A contains XML examples of I2NSF Interface Data.

Draft below also referenced by this draft contains as well the same identical examples but calls it examples of registration of capabilities and not registration interface data.

As this draft is about the Yang Data and Information model for I2NSF registration interface between the security controller and DMS and not about registration capabilities data model defined in draft below, I think the entire Appendix A can be removed from the draft.

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-i2nsf-capability-data-model>

- This comment is handled in version 18.
- Removal of the other examples except the first example.
- The first example is useful to provide the usage information of Registration Interface.

Next Step

- The Consumer-Facing Interface YANG data model and Registration Interface YANG data model have been tested through the IETF-114 Hackathon.
 - Github: <https://github.com/jaehoonpaul/i2nsf-framework>
- The reviews of the data models only show small issues such as typos.
- Consumer-Facing Interface YANG data model and Registration Interface YANG data model are ready to go toward the IESG evaluation.