

SUPA Architecture/Framework

Bert Wijnen

bwietf@bwijnen.net

Objective of this talk

- **NOT to discuss any specific Architecture/framework**
- **INSTEAD, try to get agreement on a path forward.**
- **So it does**
 - **- list what has been done sofar**
 - **- list a number of questions that have already been raised on the mlist and so whoever does design a framework/architecture, they will have to take these questions into account (in fact it might be better if the WG could agree on an answer to those questions first, because that would lead to a much more agreeable framework).**
 - **- suggest alternative next steps that the WG could consider. In the end, the WG chairs and the WG decide to choose one of those suggestions, or maybe even a completely different path.**

Previous efforts

- **draft-zhou-supra-architecture-00 (2014)**
- **draft-zhou-supra-framework-02 (2015)**
- **draft-klyus-supra-proposition-02.txt (replaced by next one)**
- **draft-klyus-supra-value-proposition-00 (March 2016)**

- **Earlier this week:**
- **draft-liu-supra-policy-based-management-framework-00.txt**
- **draft-bw-supra-architecture-00.txt**

- **And there may be others in the works or that I do not know about**

Questions that have been raised

- **Do we want to spend time on a Information Model (IM) ?**
 - **if yes, UML, plain english, other?**
 - **do we plan to use other Data Model(DM) Language than YANG**
 - **if not, are we just adding genericity/complexity for the theory?**
- **Would it be better to do a YANG policy language:**
 - **a domain specific language**
 - **that directly ties into the YANG itself**
 - **where readers are first priority, writers are second priority and**
 - **tool implementors are last priority**
- **Complexity. Are we trying to be too generic, too abstract**
- **Who are the main users of our documents?**
- **Other questions?**

What Direction to take?

- **there were a few get togethers this week with various people**
 - **No clear outcome yet.**
 - **No agreement yet on the path forward**
 - **Can SUPA WG give editors/authors any direction at this time?**
 - **we had a few people who have volunteered to work on this, we need direction**
 - **I had volunteered to take the lead, but no WG or chair decision on that I think**
 - **But cannot go at it alone. How do we organise the effort?**
- **Would it be better to form a design team first and let them come up with:**
 - **evaluation of earlier efforts**
 - **evaluation of current (and maybe new) questions**
 - **make/prepare a proposal about direction first**
 - **or maybe generate a new draft that represents consensus of the DT members?**
 - **would still have to be discussed and approved by the WG of course**

Next steps choices 1/2

- **Form a design team;**
 - **deadline say 1 month before IETF96 or maybe (aggressively) end May**
- **A design team with task: deliver one framework/architecture draft as possible WG document**
 - **WG then decide to accept or not accept this document as a base for finalising a framework**
- **Or a design team with task: deliver two or more alternative framework documents**
 - **list pros and cons of each approach**
 - **WG evaluates documents and pros and cons**
 - **WG could add/remove pros/cons from the list**
 - **Based on that decide which one to use as a base for the WG**

Next steps choices 2/2

- **Or a design team with tasks:**
 - **evaluation of earlier efforts**
 - **evaluation of current (and maybe new) questions**
 - **make/prepare a proposal about direction first**
 - **or maybe generate a new draft that represents consensus of the DT members?**
 - **would still have to be discussed and approved by the WG of course**
- **Or let individual WG members/teams come up with an individual submission draft**
 - **dealing 1 month before IETF96**
 - **WG gets to read/evaluate all drafts**
 - **At IETF96 WG decide to choose one as a base or to merge two or more**

Thank You