OpState Update

NETMOD WG Chairs
IETF 96 – Berlin

Context: IETF 94 – OpState Solution Update

- Authors of individual drafts asked to propose a joint solution
  - Two author's meetings held already
    - Notable discussion on telemetry/streaming use case
    - Some discussion on leveraging YANG push
  - Another scheduled for 2-weeks after IETF 95
  - Hopefully will have joint solution draft in April/May?
- Will then discuss on list and, probably, hold interim
  - Objective is identifying consensus on proposed direction
- Target is draft-ietf-netmod-opstate-soln-00 before Berlin
  - Following normal WG process:
    IPR polling and Poll for adoption

Since Last Meeting

- Series of calls with draft authors – two options
  - Some refinement on ideas, leading to *refined datastores*
  - No single joint solution for intended config and applied state
- WG input solicited on list to help choose between
  - Applied state is explicitly identified in models
    - Per draft-openconfig-netmod-opstate
  - Applied state will be supported via *revised conceptual data stores*, and no explicit support is required in models
    - Per draft-schoenw-netmod-revised-datastores or draft-wilton-netmod-refined-datastores
- Result:
  - B – revised conceptual data stores

Implications of Decision

Models need not, and SHOULD NOT, be structured to include nodes/leaves to indicate applied configuration

- Not part this decision:
  - The specifics of the revised conceptual data stores
    - **This is the subject of the next block of discussions**
  - How models should be structured with respect to
    - Configuration information, e.g., interface name, and
    - Non configuration related operational information, e.g., counters
    - This is covered in draft-ietf-netmod-rfc6087bis, section 5.23
      - Basically says follow the same pattern as RFC7223, i.e., "interfaces" and "interfaces-state" subtrees

Questions / Comments?

- (On points covered in this update please.)