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Changes in -04

- Additional information in UML class diagrams:
  - model-specified default values (e.g., `ipfixVersion = 10`)
  - parameters which are set by device if not configured by user labeled as `{opt.}`
  - optional parameters indicated by multiplicity `[0..1]` or `[0..*]`
  - restricted parameter usage/availability (e.g., `{SCTP only}`)
  - state parameters labeled as `{readOnly}`
Changes in -04

- **PSAMP parameters:**
  - priority on conformance with PSAMP RFCs, not with outdated PSAMP MIB structure
    - Example: match filter configured for single value IE value (as in Selector Report Interpretation). The PSAMP MIB still contains range
  - removed samplers and filters which are not mentioned RFC5476:
    - non-uniform probabilistic sampling
    - flow state sampling
    - router state filtering
    - can be standardized later or added as vendor-specific extensions
  - parameter names consistent with PSAMP information model
  - missing parameter descriptions added
Changes in -04 (cont’d)

- **SCTP parameters:**
  - no use case to configure (un)ordered delivery per Transport Session
  - `orderedDelivery` removed

- **Options Templates:**
  - removed possibility to configure individual Options Template fields
    - no use case, let the Monitoring Device choose an appropriate Template
Changes in -04 (cont’d)

- **IDs:**
  - observationPointId, selectionSequenceId, selectorId, are state parameters now (i.e., not configurable any more)
  - no use case to configure the IDs but configurable description names exist
  - simplifies the data model specification
  - Monitoring Device does not have to check consistency of user input wrt. uniqueness/scope of ID values

- **Cache parameters:**
  - clarified meaning of activeTimeout, inactiveTimeout for different Cache Modes
Next Steps

▸ No more open issues
  ● Except a YANG bug correction (Andy Bierman)

▸ Are we ready for WGLC?
  ● From an IPFIX point of view, yes
  ● From a YANG point of view, we don’t know