

IETF Network Slice Service YANG Model

[draft-ietf-teas-ietf-network-slice-nbi-yang](#)

TEAS WG

July 2023 (IETF 117)

- Bo Wu (Huawei Technologies)
- Dhruv Dhody (Huawei Technologies)
- **Reza Rokui (Ciena) (presenting on behalf of authors)**
- Tarek Saad (Cisco)
- Liuyan Han (China Mobile)
- John Mulooly (Cisco)

Contributors : Luis M. Contreras (Telefonica)

Summary of issues addressed since IETF116

Rev-06 summary:

1. Joel's comments on "isolation"
 - Only keep "traffic isolation". Remove description of "interference isolation" since it is not measurable.
2. Adrian's comments on "slo-sle-policy"
 - Separate "sle" and "slo" policy
 - Correct definition of "mtu" and "security"

Working on:

1. Med's comments
 - When both ac-svc-name and **attachment circuit attributes** are defined, the **ac-svc-name** takes precedence.
 - YANG module definition improvement using existing IETF references for RFCs and Units. Also improving identity description.
 - Change **leaf incoming-bw-value** from **te-types:te-bandwidth** type to a gauge64 value and change name to **pe-to-ce-bandwidth**
 - Remove the reference and description of I-D.liu-teas-transport-network-slice-yang

<https://github.com/lana-wu/ietf-ns-nbi/issues>

Issue#1 Custom topology definition

- Currently our NBI Yang model has an attributed "**custom-topology-ref**" which refers a prebuilt network topology
- **Issue:** Rather than a reference, [draft-liu-teas-transport-network-slice-yang](#) augments RFC8345 to the NS Service Model.
 - However, new [draft-boucadair-teas-ietf-slicing-overview](#) suggests the reference is useful for SAP (RFC9408) as a customized topology
- **Proposal:** Keep current attribute "**custom-topology-ref**" since it is flexible for SAP or VN or other abstract models as the custom topology.





Figure 4: Network Topology with CEs and ACs



RFC9408 Data Model for Service Attachment Points (SAPs)

draft-liu-teas-transport-network-slice-yang-07

Issue#2 SDP QoS attributes (Raised by Med)

- **Issue:** For both 'incoming-qos-policy' and 'outgoing-qos-policy' the model does not allow to control the bw per QoS class, port, etc. (RFC 9291).
- **Proposal:** Replace the existing 'incoming-qos-policy' and 'outgoing-qos-policy' with bandwidth definition on RFC 9291 (see below, i.e, replace it with right hand side definition)
- **Action:** Needs more discussion.

```
+--rw incoming-qos-policy
| +--rw qos-policy-name? string
| +--rw rate-limits
|   +--rw cir? uint64
|   +--rw cbs? uint64
|   +--rw eir? uint64
|   +--rw ebs? uint64
|   +--rw pir? uint64
|   +--rw pbs? uint64
+--rw outgoing-qos-policy
| +--rw qos-policy-name? string
| +--rw rate-limits
|   +--rw cir? uint64
|   +--rw cbs? uint64
|   +--rw eir? uint64
|   +--rw ebs? uint64
|   +--rw pir? uint64
|   +--rw pbs? uint64
```



```
+--rw svc-pe-to-ce-bandwidth
| +--rw pe-to-ce-bandwidth* [bw-type]
|   +--rw bw-type identityref
|   +--rw (type)?
|     +--:(per-cos)
|       | +--rw cos* [cos-id]
|       |   +--rw cos-id uint8
|       |   +--rw cir? uint64
|       |   ...
|       +--:(other)
|         +--rw cir? uint64
|         +--rw cbs? uint64
|         +--rw eir? uint64
|         | ...
|         +--rw pir? uint64
|         +--rw pbs? uint64
+--rw svc-ce-to-pe-bandwidth
| +--rw ce-to-pe-bandwidth* [bw-type]
|   +--rw bw-type identityref
|   +--rw (type)?
|     +--:(per-cos)
|       | +--rw cos* [cos-id]
|       |   +--rw cos-id uint8
|       |   +--rw cir? uint64
|       |   +--rw cbs? uint64
|       |   ...
|       |   +--rw pbs? uint64
|       +--:(other)
|         +--rw cir? uint64
|         +--rw cbs? uint64
|         +--rw eir? uint64
|         | ...
|         +--rw pbs? uint64
```

Next step

- Resolve the comments
- Asking for WGLC

Thank You!