Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Obsoletes: 6087 (if approved)
Intended status: BCP
Expires: August 9, 2018

A. Bierman
YumaWorks

February 5, 2018

Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers of YANG Data Model Documents
draft-ietf-netmod-rfc6087bis-17

Abstract

This memo provides guidelines for authors and reviewers of Standards Track specifications containing YANG data model modules. Applicable portions may be used as a basis for reviews of other YANG data model documents. Recommendations and procedures are defined, which are intended to increase interoperability and usability of Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) and RESTCONF protocol implementations that utilize YANG data model modules. This document obsoletes RFC 6087.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 9, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect

to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 5
1.1. Changes Since RFC 6087 5
2. Terminology 8
2.1. Requirements Notation 8
2.2. NETCONF Terms 8
2.3. YANG Terms 8
2.4. NMDA Terms 9
2.5. Terms 9
3. General Documentation Guidelines 10
3.1. Module Copyright 10
3.2. Code Components 10
3.2.1. Example Modules 11
3.3. Terminology Section 11
3.4. Tree Diagrams 11
3.5. Narrative Sections 12
3.6. Definitions Section 12
3.7. Security Considerations Section 13
3.7.1. Security Considerations Section Template 13
3.8. IANA Considerations Section 15
3.8.1. Documents that Create a New Namespace 15
3.8.2. Documents that Extend an Existing Namespace 15
3.9. Reference Sections 15
3.10. Validation Tools 16
3.11. Module Extraction Tools 16
3.12. Module Usage Examples 17
4. YANG Usage Guidelines 18
4.1. Module Naming Conventions 18
4.2. Prefixes 19
4.3. Identifiers 20
4.3.1. Identifier Naming Conventions 20
4.4. Defaults 21
4.5. Conditional Statements 21
4.6. XPath Usage 22
4.6.1. XPath Evaluation Contexts 22
4.6.2. Function Library 23
4.6.3. Axes 24
4.6.4. Types 24
4.6.5. Wildcards 25
4.6.6. Boolean Expressions 26
4.7. YANG Definition Lifecycle Management 27

4.8. Module Header, Meta, and Revision Statements 28
4.9. Namespace Assignments 29
4.10. Top-Level Data Definitions 30
4.11. Data Types 31
4.11.1. Fixed Value Extensibility 31
4.11.2. Patterns and Ranges 32
4.11.3. Enumerations and Bits 33
4.11.4. Union Types 33
4.11.5. Empty and Boolean 34
4.12. Reusable Type Definitions 35
4.13. Reusable Groupings 36
4.14. Data Definitions 37
4.14.1. Non-Presence Containers 38
4.14.2. Top-Level Data Nodes 39
4.15. Operation Definitions 39
4.16. Notification Definitions 39
4.17. Feature Definitions 40
4.18. YANG Data Node Constraints 41
4.18.1. Controlling Quantity 41
4.18.2. must vs. when 41
4.19. Augment Statements 41
4.19.1. Conditional Augment Statements 42
4.19.2. Conditionally Mandatory Data Definition Statements . . 42
4.20. Deviation Statements 44
4.21. Extension Statements 45
4.22. Data Correlation 45
4.22.1. Use of Leafref for Key Correlation 46
4.23. Operational State 47
4.23.1. Combining Operational State and Configuration Data . . 47
4.23.2. Representing Operational Values of Configuration Data 48
4.23.3. NMDA Transition Guidelines 48
4.24. Performance Considerations 52
4.25. Open Systems Considerations 53
4.26. YANG 1.1 Guidelines 53
4.26.1. Importing Multiple Revisions 53
4.26.2. Using Feature Logic 53
4.26.3. anyxml vs. anydata 54
4.26.4. action vs. rpc 54
4.27. Updating YANG Modules (Published vs. Unpublished) 55
5. IANA Considerations 56
6. Security Considerations 57
7. Acknowledgments 58
8. References 59
8.1. Normative References 59
8.2. Informative References 59
Appendix A. Change Log 62
A.1. v15 to v16 62

A.2. v15 to v16 62
A.3. v14 to v15 62
A.4. v13 to v14 62
A.5. v12 to v13 62
A.6. v11 to v12 63
A.7. v10 to v11 63
A.8. v09 to v10 63
A.9. v08 to v09 63
A.10. v07 to v08 63
A.11. v06 to v07 64
A.12. v05 to v06 64
A.13. v04 to v05 64
A.14. v03 ot v04 65
A.15. v02 to v03 65
A.16. v01 to v02 65
A.17. v00 to v01 65
Appendix B. Module Review Checklist 67
Appendix C. YANG Module Template 69
Author's Address 71

1. Introduction

The standardization of network configuration interfaces for use with network configuration management protocols, such as the Network Configuration Protocol [RFC6241] and RESTCONF [RFC8040], requires a modular set of data models, which can be reused and extended over time.

This document defines a set of usage guidelines for Standards Track documents containing YANG 1.1 [RFC7950] and YANG 1.0 [RFC6020] data models. YANG is used to define the data structures, protocol operations, and notification content used within a NETCONF and/or RESTCONF server. A NETCONF or RESTCONF server that supports a particular YANG module will support client NETCONF and/or RESTCONF operation requests, as indicated by the specific content defined in the YANG module.

Many YANG constructs are defined as optional to use, such as the description statement. However, in order to make YANG modules more useful, it is desirable to define a set of usage guidelines that entails a higher level of compliance than the minimum level defined in the YANG specification.

In addition, YANG allows constructs such as infinite length identifiers and string values, or top-level mandatory nodes, that a compliant server is not required to support. Only constructs that all servers are required to support can be used in IETF YANG modules.

This document defines usage guidelines related to the NETCONF operations layer and NETCONF content layer, as defined in [RFC6241], and the RESTCONF methods and RESTCONF resources, as defined in [RFC8040],

These guidelines are intended to be used by authors and reviewers to improve the readability and interoperability of published YANG data models.

Note that this document is not a YANG tutorial and the reader is expected to know the YANG data modeling language before using this document.

1.1. Changes Since RFC 6087

The following changes have been made to the guidelines published in [RFC6087]:

- Updated NETCONF reference from RFC 4741 to RFC 6241
- Updated NETCONF over SSH citation from RFC 4742 to RFC 6242
- Updated YANG Types reference from RFC 6021 to RFC 6991
- Updated obsolete URLs for IETF resources
- Changed top-level data node guideline
- Clarified XPath usage for a literal value representing a YANG identity
- Clarified XPath usage for a when-stmt
- Clarified XPath usage for 'proceeding-sibling' and 'following-sibling' axes
- Added terminology guidelines
- Added YANG tree diagram guidelines
- Updated XPath guidelines for type conversions and function library usage.
- Updated data types section
- Updated notifications section
- Clarified conditional key leaf nodes
- Clarify usage of 'uint64' and 'int64' data types
- Added text on YANG feature usage
- Added Identifier Naming Conventions
- Clarified use of mandatory nodes with conditional augmentations
- Clarified namespace and domain conventions for example modules
- Clarified conventions for identifying code components
- Added YANG 1.1 guidelines
- Added Data Model Constraints section

- Added mention of RESTCONF protocol
- Added guidelines for NMDA Revised Datastores

2. Terminology

2.1. Requirements Notation

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

RFC 2119 language is used here to express the views of the NETMOD working group regarding content for YANG modules. YANG modules complying with this document will treat the RFC 2119 terminology as if it were describing best current practices.

2.2. NETCONF Terms

The following terms are defined in [RFC6241] and are not redefined here:

- capabilities
- client
- operation
- server

2.3. YANG Terms

The following terms are defined in [RFC7950] and are not redefined here:

- data node
- module
- namespace
- submodule
- version
- YANG
- YIN

Note that the term 'module' may be used as a generic term for a YANG

module or submodule. When describing properties that are specific to submodules, the term 'submodule' is used instead.

2.4. NMDA Terms

The following terms are defined in the Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA) [I-D.ietf-netmod-revised-datastores]. and are not redefined here:

- configuration
- conventional configuration datastore
- datastore
- operational state
- operational state datastore

2.5. Terms

The following terms are used throughout this document:

- published: A stable release of a module or submodule. For example the "Request for Comments" described in section 2.1 of [RFC2026] is considered a stable publication.
- unpublished: An unstable release of a module or submodule. For example the "Internet-Draft" described in section 2.2 of [RFC2026] is considered an unstable publication that is a work-in-progress, subject to change at any time.
- YANG fragment: A set of YANG statements that are not intended to represent a complete YANG module or submodule. These statements are not intended for actual use, except to provide an example of YANG statement usage. The invalid syntax "..." is sometimes used to indicate that additional YANG statements would be present in a real YANG module.
- YANG tree diagram: a diagram representing the contents of a YANG module, as defined in [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-tree-diagrams]. Also called a "tree diagram".

3. General Documentation Guidelines

YANG data model modules under review are likely to be contained in Internet-Drafts. All guidelines for Internet-Draft authors MUST be followed. The RFC Editor provides guidelines for authors of RFCs, which are first published as Internet-Drafts. These guidelines should be followed and are defined in [RFC7322] and updated in [RFC7841] and "RFC Document Style" [RFC-STYLE].

The following sections MUST be present in an Internet-Draft containing a module:

- Narrative sections
- Definitions section
- Security Considerations section
- IANA Considerations section
- References section

There are three usage scenarios for YANG that can appear in an Internet-Draft or RFC:

- normative module or submodule
- example module or submodule
- example YANG fragment not part of any module or submodule

The guidelines in this document refer mainly to a normative module or submodule, but may be applicable to example modules and YANG fragments as well.

3.1. Module Copyright

The module description statement MUST contain a reference to the latest approved IETF Trust Copyright statement, which is available online at:

http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/

3.2. Code Components

Each normative YANG module or submodule contained within an Internet-Draft or RFC is considered to be a code component. The strings "<CODE BEGINS>" and "<CODE ENDS>" MUST be used to identify each code

component.

The "<CODE BEGINS>" tag SHOULD be followed by a string identifying the file name specified in Section 5.2 of [RFC7950]. The name string form that includes the revision-date SHOULD be used. The revision date MUST match the date used in the most recent revision of the module.

The following example is for the '2010-01-18' revision of the 'ietf-foo' module:

<CODE BEGINS> file "ietf-foo@2016-03-20.yang"

```
    module ietf-foo {
      namespace "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-foo";
      prefix "foo";
      organization "...";
      contact "...";
      description "...";
      revision 2016-03-20 {
        description "Latest revision";
        reference "RFC XXXX";
      }
      // ... more statements
    }
```

<CODE ENDS>

3.2.1. Example Modules

Example modules are not code components. The <CODE BEGINS> convention MUST NOT be used for example modules.

An example module SHOULD be named using the term "example", followed by a hyphen, followed by a descriptive name, e.g., "example-toaster". See Section 4.9 regarding the namespace guidelines for example modules.

3.3. Terminology Section

A terminology section MUST be present if any terms are defined in the document or if any terms are imported from other documents.

3.4. Tree Diagrams

YANG tree diagrams provide a concise representation of a YANG module, and SHOULD be included to help readers understand YANG module structure. Guidelines on tree diagrams can be found in Section 3 of

[I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-tree-diagrams].

If YANG tree diagrams are used, then an informative reference to the YANG tree diagrams specification MUST be included in the document. Refer to Section 2.2 of [I-D.ietf-netmod-rfc8022bis] for an example of such a reference.

3.5. Narrative Sections

The narrative part MUST include an overview section that describes the scope and field of application of the module(s) defined by the specification and that specifies the relationship (if any) of these modules to other standards, particularly to standards containing other YANG modules. The narrative part SHOULD include one or more sections to briefly describe the structure of the modules defined in the specification.

If the module(s) defined by the specification imports definitions from other modules (except for those defined in the [RFC7950] or [RFC6991] documents), or are always implemented in conjunction with other modules, then those facts MUST be noted in the overview section, as MUST be noted any special interpretations of definitions in other modules. Refer to section 2.3 of [I-D.ietf-netmod-rfc8022bis] for an example of this overview section.

If the documents contains YANG module(s) that are compliant with the Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA) [I-D.ietf-netmod-revised-datastores], then the Abstract and Introduction sections should mention this fact.

Example:

The YANG model in this document conforms to the Network Management Datastore Architecture defined in I-D.ietf-netmod-revised-datastores.

3.6. Definitions Section

This section contains the module(s) defined by the specification. These modules SHOULD be written using the YANG 1.1 [RFC7950] syntax. YANG 1.0 [RFC6020] syntax MAY be used if no YANG 1.1 constructs or semantics are needed in the module. If any of the imported YANG modules are written using YANG 1.1, then the module MUST be written using YANG 1.1.

A YIN syntax version of the module MAY also be present in the document. There MAY also be other types of modules present in the document, such as SMIv2, which are not affected by these guidelines.

Note that all YANG statements within a YANG module are considered normative, if the module itself is considered normative, and not an example module or example YANG fragment. The use of keywords defined in [RFC2119] apply to YANG description statements in normative modules exactly as they would in any other normative section.

Example YANG modules and example YANG fragments MUST NOT contain any normative text, including any reserved words from [RFC2119].

See Section 4 for guidelines on YANG usage.

3.7. Security Considerations Section

Each specification that defines one or more modules MUST contain a section that discusses security considerations relevant to those modules.

This section MUST be patterned after the latest approved template (available at http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/ops/trac/wiki/yang-security-guidelines). Section 3.7.1 contains the security considerations template dated 2013-05-08 and last updated 2017-12-21. Authors MUST check the WEB page at the URL listed above in case there is a more recent version available.

In particular:

- Writable data nodes that could be especially disruptive if abused MUST be explicitly listed by name and the associated security risks MUST be explained.

- Readable data nodes that contain especially sensitive information or that raise significant privacy concerns MUST be explicitly listed by name and the reasons for the sensitivity/privacy concerns MUST be explained.

- Operations (i.e., YANG 'rpc' statements) that are potentially harmful to system behavior or that raise significant privacy concerns MUST be explicitly listed by name and the reasons for the sensitivity/privacy concerns MUST be explained.

3.7.1. Security Considerations Section Template

X. Security Considerations

The YANG module specified in this document defines a schema for data that is designed to be accessed via network management protocols such as NETCONF [RFC6241] or RESTCONF [RFC8040]. The lowest NETCONF layer is the secure transport layer, and the mandatory-to-implement secure

transport is Secure Shell (SSH) [RFC6242]. The lowest RESTCONF layer is HTTPS, and the mandatory-to-implement secure transport is TLS [RFC5246].

The NETCONF access control model [RFC6536] provides the means to restrict access for particular NETCONF or RESTCONF users to a preconfigured subset of all available NETCONF or RESTCONF protocol operations and content.

```
 -- if you have any writeable data nodes (those are all the
 -- "config true" nodes, and remember, that is the default)
 -- describe their specific sensitivity or vulnerability.
```

There are a number of data nodes defined in this YANG module that are writable/creatable/deletable (i.e., config true, which is the default). These data nodes may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. Write operations (e.g., edit-config) to these data nodes without proper protection can have a negative effect on network operations. These are the subtrees and data nodes and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

<list subtrees and data nodes and state why they are sensitive>

```
 -- for all YANG modules you must evaluate whether any readable data
 -- nodes (those are all the "config false" nodes, but also all other
 -- nodes, because they can also be read via operations like get or
 -- get-config) are sensitive or vulnerable (for instance, if they
 -- might reveal customer information or violate personal privacy
 -- laws such as those of the European Union if exposed to
 -- unauthorized parties)
```

Some of the readable data nodes in this YANG module may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. It is thus important to control read access (e.g., via get, get-config, or notification) to these data nodes. These are the subtrees and data nodes and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

<list subtrees and data nodes and state why they are sensitive>

```
 -- if your YANG module has defined any rpc operations
 -- describe their specific sensitivity or vulnerability.
```

Some of the RPC operations in this YANG module may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. It is thus important to control access to these operations. These are the operations and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

<list RPC operations and state why they are sensitive>

3.8. IANA Considerations Section

In order to comply with IESG policy as set forth in http://www.ietf.org/id-info/checklist.html, every Internet-Draft that is submitted to the IESG for publication MUST contain an IANA Considerations section. The requirements for this section vary depending on what actions are required of the IANA. If there are no IANA considerations applicable to the document, then the IANA Considerations section stating that there are no actions is removed by the RFC Editor before publication. Refer to the guidelines in [RFC8126] for more details.

Each normative YANG module MUST be registered in the XML namespace Registry [RFC3688], and the YANG Module Names Registry [RFC6020]. This applies to new modules and updated modules. Examples of these registrations for the "ietf-template" module can be found in Section 5.

3.8.1. Documents that Create a New Namespace

If an Internet-Draft defines a new namespace that is to be administered by the IANA, then the document MUST include an IANA Considerations section that specifies how the namespace is to be administered.

Specifically, if any YANG module namespace statement value contained in the document is not already registered with IANA, then a new YANG Namespace registry entry MUST be requested from the IANA. The [RFC7950] specification includes the procedure for this purpose in its IANA Considerations section.

3.8.2. Documents that Extend an Existing Namespace

It is possible to extend an existing namespace using a YANG submodule that belongs to an existing module already administered by IANA. In this case, the document containing the main module MUST be updated to use the latest revision of the submodule.

3.9. Reference Sections

For every import or include statement that appears in a module contained in the specification, which identifies a module in a separate document, a corresponding normative reference to that document MUST appear in the Normative References section. The reference MUST correspond to the specific module version actually used within the specification.

For every normative reference statement that appears in a module

contained in the specification, which identifies a separate document, a corresponding normative reference to that document SHOULD appear in the Normative References section. The reference SHOULD correspond to the specific document version actually used within the specification. If the reference statement identifies an informative reference, which identifies a separate document, a corresponding informative reference to that document MAY appear in the Informative References section.

3.10. Validation Tools

All modules need to be validated before submission in an Internet Draft. The 'pyang' YANG compiler is freely available from github:

https://github.com/mbj4668/pyang

If the 'pyang' compiler is used to validate a normative module, then the "--ietf" command line option MUST be used to identify any IETF guideline issues.

If the 'pyang' compiler is used to validate an example module, then the "--ietf" command line option MAY be used to identify any IETF guideline issues.

The "yanglint" program is also freely available from github.

https://github.com/CESNET/libyang

This tool can be used to validate XPath statements within YANG modules.

3.11. Module Extraction Tools

A version of 'rfcstrip' is available which will extract YANG modules from an Internet Draft or RFC. The 'rfcstrip' tool which supports YANG module extraction is freely available:

http://www.yang-central.org/twiki/pub/Main/YangTools/rfcstrip

This tool can be used to verify that the "<CODE BEGINS>" and "<CODE ENDS>" tags are used correctly and that the normative YANG modules can be extracted correctly.

The "xym" tool is freely available on github and can be used to extract YANG modules from a document.

https://github.com/xym-tool/xym

3.12. Module Usage Examples

Each specification that defines one or more modules SHOULD contain usage examples, either throughout the document or in an appendix. This includes example instance document snippets in an appropriate encoding (e.g., XML and/or JSON) to demonstrate the intended usage of the YANG module(s). Example modules MUST be validated. Refer to Section 3.10 for tools which validate YANG modules.

4. YANG Usage Guidelines

Modules in IETF Standards Track specifications MUST comply with all syntactic and semantic requirements of YANG 1.1 [RFC7950]. See the exception for YANG 1.0 in Section 3.6. The guidelines in this section are intended to supplement the YANG specification, which is intended to define a minimum set of conformance requirements.

In order to promote interoperability and establish a set of practices based on previous experience, the following sections establish usage guidelines for specific YANG constructs.

Only guidelines that clarify or restrict the minimum conformance requirements are included here.

4.1. Module Naming Conventions

Normative modules contained in Standards Track documents MUST be named according to the guidelines in the IANA Considerations section of [RFC7950].

A distinctive word or acronym (e.g., protocol name or working group acronym) SHOULD be used in the module name. If new definitions are being defined to extend one or more existing modules, then the same word or acronym should be reused, instead of creating a new one.

All published module names MUST be unique. For a YANG module published in an RFC, this uniqueness is guaranteed by IANA. For unpublished modules, the authors need to check that no other work in progress is using the same module name.

Example modules are non-normative, and SHOULD be named with the prefix "example-".

It is suggested that a stable prefix be selected representing the entire organization. All normative YANG modules published by the IETF MUST begin with the prefix "ietf-". Another standards organization, such as the IEEE, might use the prefix "ieee-" for all YANG modules.

Once a module name is published, it MUST NOT be reused, even if the RFC containing the module is reclassified to 'Historic' status. A module name cannot be changed in YANG, and this would be treated as a a new module, not a name change.

4.2. Prefixes

All YANG definitions are scoped by the module containing the definition being referenced. This allows definitions from multiple modules to be used, even if the names are not unique. In the example below, the identifier "foo" is used in all 3 modules:

```
module example-foo {
  namespace "http://example.com/ns/foo";
  prefix f;

  container foo;
}

module example-bar {
  namespace "http://example.com/ns/bar";
  prefix b;

  typedef foo { type uint32; }
}

module example-one {
  namespace "http://example.com/ns/one";
  prefix one;
  import example-foo { prefix f; }
  import example-bar { prefix b; }

  augment "/f:foo" {
     leaf foo { type b:foo; }
  }
}
```

YANG defines the following rules for prefix usage:

- Prefixes are never allowed for built in data types and YANG keywords.
- A prefix MUST be used for any external statement (i.e., a statement defined with the YANG "extension" statement)
- The proper module prefix MUST be used for all identifiers imported from other modules
- The proper module prefix MUST be used for all identifiers included from a submodule.

The following guidelines apply to prefix usage of the current (local) module:

- The local module prefix SHOULD be used instead of no prefix in all path expressions.

- The local module prefix MUST be used instead of no prefix in all "default" statements for an "identityref" or "instance-identifier" data type

- The local module prefix MAY be used for references to typedefs, groupings, extensions, features, and identities defined in the module.

Prefix values SHOULD be short, but also likely to be unique. Prefix values SHOULD NOT conflict with known modules that have been previously published.

4.3. Identifiers

Identifiers for all YANG identifiers in published modules MUST be between 1 and 64 characters in length. These include any construct specified as an 'identifier-arg-str' token in the ABNF in Section 13 of [RFC7950].

4.3.1. Identifier Naming Conventions

Identifiers SHOULD follow a consistent naming pattern throughout the module. Only lower-case letters, numbers, and dashes SHOULD be used in identifier names. Upper-case characters and the underscore character MAY be used if the identifier represents a well-known value that uses these characters.

Identifiers SHOULD include complete words and/or well-known acronyms or abbreviations. Child nodes within a container or list SHOULD NOT replicate the parent identifier. YANG identifiers are hierarchical and are only meant to be unique within the the set of sibling nodes defined in the same module namespace.

It is permissible to use common identifiers such as "name" or "id" in data definition statements, especially if these data nodes share a common data type.

Identifiers SHOULD NOT carry any special semantics that identify data modelling properties. Only YANG statements and YANG extension statements are designed to convey machine readable data modelling properties. For example, naming an object "config" or "state" does not change whether it is configuration data or state data. Only defined YANG statements or YANG extension statements can be used to assign semantics in a machine readable format in YANG.

4.4. Defaults

In general, it is suggested that substatements containing very common default values SHOULD NOT be present. The following substatements are commonly used with the default value, which would make the module difficult to read if used everywhere they are allowed.

Statement	Default Value
config	true
mandatory	false
max-elements	unbounded
min-elements	0
ordered-by	system
status	current
yin-element	false

Statement Defaults

4.5. Conditional Statements

A module may be conceptually partitioned in several ways, using the 'if-feature' and/or 'when' statements.

Data model designers need to carefully consider all modularity aspects, including the use of YANG conditional statements.

If a data definition is optional, depending on server support for a NETCONF or RESTCONF protocol capability, then a YANG 'feature' statement SHOULD be defined. The defined "feature" statement SHOULD then be used in the conditional "if-feature" statement referencing the optional data definition.

If any notification data, or any data definition, for a non-configuration data node is not mandatory, then the server may or may not be required to return an instance of this data node. If any conditional requirements exist for returning the data node in a notification payload or retrieval request, they MUST be documented somewhere. For example, a 'when' or 'if-feature' statement could apply to the data node, or the conditional requirements could be explained in a 'description' statement within the data node or one of its ancestors (if any).

If any 'if-feature' statements apply to a list node, then the same 'if-feature' statements MUST apply to any key leaf nodes for the list. There MUST NOT be any 'if-feature' statements applied to any

key leaf that do not also apply to the parent list node.

There SHOULD NOT be any 'when' statements applied to a key leaf node. It is possible that a 'when' statement for an ancestor node of a key leaf will have the exact node-set result as the key leaf. In such a case, the 'when' statement for the key leaf is redundant and SHOULD be avoided.

4.6. XPath Usage

This section describes guidelines for using the XML Path Language [W3C.REC-xpath-19991116] (XPath) within YANG modules.

4.6.1. XPath Evaluation Contexts

YANG defines 5 separate contexts for evaluation of XPath statements:

1) The "running" datastore: collection of all YANG configuration data nodes. The document root is the conceptual container, (e.g., "config" in the "edit-config" operation), which is the parent of all top-level data definition statements with a "config" statement value of "true".

2) State data + the "running" datastore: collection of all YANG data nodes. The document root is the conceptual container, parent of all top-level data definition statements.

3) Notification: an event notification document. The document root is the notification element.

4) RPC Input: The document root is the conceptual "input" node, which is the parent of all RPC input parameter definitions.

5) RPC Output: The document root is the conceptual "output" node, which is the parent of all RPC output parameter definitions.

Note that these XPath contexts cannot be mixed. For example, a "when" statement in a notification context cannot reference configuration data.

```
    notification foo {
      leaf mtu {
        // NOT OK because when-stmt context is this notification
        when "/if:interfaces/if:interface[name='eth0']";
        type leafref {
          // OK because path-stmt has a different context
          path "/if:interfaces/if:interface/if:mtu";
        }
      }
    }
```

It is especially important to consider the XPath evaluation context for XPath expressions defined in groupings. An XPath expression defined in a grouping may not be portable, meaning it cannot be used in multiple contexts and produce proper results.

If the XPath expressions defined in a grouping are intended for a particular context, then this context SHOULD be identified in the "description" statement for the grouping.

4.6.2. Function Library

The 'position' and 'last' functions SHOULD NOT be used. This applies to implicit use of the 'position' function as well (e.g., '//chapter[42]'). A server is only required to maintain the relative XML document order of all instances of a particular user-ordered list or leaf-list. The 'position' and 'last' functions MAY be used if they are evaluated in a context where the context node is a user-ordered 'list' or 'leaf-list'.

The 'id' function SHOULD NOT be used. The 'ID' attribute is not present in YANG documents so this function has no meaning. The YANG compiler SHOULD return an empty string for this function.

The 'namespace-uri' and 'name' functions SHOULD NOT be used. Expanded names in XPath are different than YANG. A specific canonical representation of a YANG expanded name does not exist.

The 'lang' function SHOULD NOT be used. This function does not apply to YANG because there is no 'lang' attribute set with the document. The YANG compiler SHOULD return 'false' for this function.

The 'local-name', 'namespace-uri', 'name', 'string', and 'number' functions SHOULD NOT be used if the argument is a node-set. If so, the function result will be determined by the document order of the node-set. Since this order can be different on each server, the function results can also be different. Any function call that implicitly converts a node-set to a string will also have this issue.

The 'local-name' function SHOULD NOT be used to reference local names outside of the YANG module defining the must or when expression containing the 'local-name' function. Example of a local-name function that should not be used:

```
/*[local-name()='foo']
```

The 'derived-from-or-self' function SHOULD be used instead of an equality expression for identityref values. This allows the identities to be conceptually augmented.

Example:

```
// do not use
when "md-name-format = 'name-format-null'";

// this is preferred
when "derived-from-or-self(md-name-format, 'name-format-null')";
```

4.6.3. Axes

The 'attribute' and 'namespace' axes are not supported in YANG, and MAY be empty in a NETCONF or RESTCONF server implementation.

The 'preceding', and 'following' axes SHOULD NOT be used. These constructs rely on XML document order within a NETCONF or RESTCONF server configuration database, which may not be supported consistently or produce reliable results across implementations. Predicate expressions based on static node properties (e.g., element name or value, 'ancestor' or 'descendant' axes) SHOULD be used instead. The 'preceding' and 'following' axes MAY be used if document order is not relevant to the outcome of the expression (e.g., check for global uniqueness of a parameter value).

The 'preceding-sibling' and 'following-sibling' axes SHOULD NOT used, however they MAY be used if document order is not relevant to the outcome of the expression.

A server is only required to maintain the relative XML document order of all instances of a particular user-ordered list or leaf-list. The 'preceding-sibling' and 'following-sibling' axes MAY be used if they are evaluated in a context where the context node is a user-ordered 'list' or 'leaf-list'.

4.6.4. Types

Data nodes that use the 'int64' and 'uint64' built-in type SHOULD NOT be used within numeric or boolean expressions. There are boundary

conditions in which the translation from the YANG 64-bit type to an XPath number can cause incorrect results. Specifically, an XPath 'double' precision floating point number cannot represent very large positive or negative 64-bit numbers because it only provides a total precision of 53 bits. The 'int64' and 'uint64' data types MAY be used in numeric expressions if the value can be represented with no more than 53 bits of precision.

Data modelers need to be careful not to confuse the YANG value space and the XPath value space. The data types are not the same in both, and conversion between YANG and XPath data types SHOULD be considered carefully.

Explicit XPath data type conversions MAY be used (e.g., 'string', 'boolean', or 'number' functions), instead of implicit XPath data type conversions.

XPath expressions that contain a literal value representing a YANG identity SHOULD always include the declared prefix of the module where the identity is defined.

XPath expressions for 'when' statements SHOULD NOT reference the context node or any descendant nodes of the context node. They MAY reference descendant nodes if the 'when' statement is contained within an 'augment' statement, and the referenced nodes are not defined within the 'augment' statement.

Example:

```
augment "/rt:active-route/rt:input/rt:destination-address" {
   when "rt:address-family='v4ur:ipv4-unicast'" {
     description
       "This augment is valid only for IPv4 unicast.";
   }
   // nodes defined here within the augment-stmt
   // cannot be referenced in the when-stmt
}
```

4.6.5. Wildcards

It is possible to construct XPath expressions that will evaluate differently when combined with several modules within a server implementation, then when evaluated within the single module. This is due to augmenting nodes from other modules.

Wildcard expansion is done within a server against all the nodes from all namespaces, so it is possible for a 'must' or 'when' expression that uses the '*' operator will always evaluate to false if processed

within a single YANG module. In such cases, the 'description' statement SHOULD clarify that augmenting objects are expected to match the wildcard expansion.

```
   when /foo/services/*/active {
     description
       "No services directly defined in this module.
        Matches objects that have augmented the services container.";
   }
```

4.6.6. Boolean Expressions

The YANG "must" and "when" statements use an XPath boolean expression to define the test condition for the statement. It is important to specify these expressions in a way that will not cause inadvertent changes in the result if the objects referenced in the expression are updated in future revisions of the module.

For example, the leaf "foo2" must exist if the leaf "foo1" is equal to "one" or "three":

```
     leaf foo1 {
       type enumeration {
          enum one;
          enum two;
          enum three;
       }
     }

     leaf foo2 {
       // INCORRECT
       must "/f:foo1 != 'two'";
       type string;
     }

     leaf foo2 {
       // CORRECT
       must "/f:foo1 = 'one' or /f:foo1 = 'three'";
       type string;
     }
```

In the next revision of the module, leaf "foo1" is extended with a new enum named "four":

```
leaf foo1 {
  type enumeration {
     enum one;
     enum two;
     enum three;
     enum four;
  }
}
```

Now the first XPath expression will allow the enum "four" to be accepted in addition to the "one" and "three" enum values.

4.7. YANG Definition Lifecycle Management

The YANG status statement MUST be present within a definition if its value is 'deprecated' or 'obsolete'. The status SHOULD NOT be changed from 'current' directly to 'obsolete'. An object SHOULD be available for at least one year with 'deprecated' status before it is changed to 'obsolete'.

The module or submodule name MUST NOT be changed, once the document containing the module or submodule is published.

The module namespace URI value MUST NOT be changed, once the document containing the module is published.

The revision-date substatement within the import statement SHOULD be present if any groupings are used from the external module.

The revision-date substatement within the include statement SHOULD be present if any groupings are used from the external submodule.

If an import statement is for a module from a stable source (e.g., an RFC for an IETF module), then a reference-stmt SHOULD be present within an import statement.

```
import ietf-yang-types {
   prefix yang;
   reference "RFC 6991";
}
```

If submodules are used, then the document containing the main module MUST be updated so that the main module revision date is equal or more recent than the revision date of any submodule that is (directly or indirectly) included by the main module.

Definitions for future use SHOULD NOT be specified in a module. Do not specify placeholder objects like the "reserved" example below:

```
      leaf reserved {
        type string;
        description
          "This object has no purpose at this time, but a future
           revision of this module might define a purpose
           for this object.";
        }
      }
```

4.8. Module Header, Meta, and Revision Statements

For published modules, the namespace MUST be a globally unique URI, as defined in [RFC3986]. This value is usually assigned by the IANA.

The organization statement MUST be present. If the module is contained in a document intended for IETF Standards Track status, then the organization SHOULD be the IETF working group chartered to write the document. For other standards organizations, a similar approach is also suggested.

The contact statement MUST be present. If the module is contained in a document intended for Standards Track status, then the working group web and mailing information MUST be present, and the main document author or editor contact information SHOULD be present. If additional authors or editors exist, their contact information MAY be present. There is no need to include the contact information for Working Group chairs.

The description statement MUST be present. For modules published within IETF documents, the appropriate IETF Trust Copyright text MUST be present, as described in Section 3.1.

If the module relies on information contained in other documents, which are not the same documents implied by the import statements present in the module, then these documents MUST be identified in the reference statement.

A revision statement MUST be present for each published version of the module. The revision statement MUST have a reference substatement. It MUST identify the published document that contains the module. Modules are often extracted from their original documents, and it is useful for developers and operators to know how to find the original source document in a consistent manner. The revision statement MAY have a description substatement.

It is not required to keep the full revision history of draft versions (e.g., modules contained within Internet-Drafts). That is, within a sequence of draft versions, only the most recent revision

need be recorded in the module. However, whenever a new (i.e. changed) version is made available (e.g., via a new version of an Internet-Draft), the revision date of that new version MUST be updated to a date later than that of the previous version.

4.9. Namespace Assignments

It is RECOMMENDED that only valid YANG modules be included in documents, whether or not they are published yet. This allows:

- the module to compile correctly instead of generating disruptive fatal errors.
- early implementors to use the modules without picking a random value for the XML namespace.
- early interoperability testing since independent implementations will use the same XML namespace value.

Until a URI is assigned by the IANA, a proposed namespace URI MUST be provided for the namespace statement in a YANG module. A value SHOULD be selected that is not likely to collide with other YANG namespaces. Standard module names, prefixes, and URI strings already listed in the YANG Module Registry MUST NOT be used.

A standard namespace statement value SHOULD have the following form:

```
<URN prefix string>:<module-name>
```

The following URN prefix string SHOULD be used for published and unpublished YANG modules:

```
urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:
```

The following example URNs would be valid namespace statement values for Standards Track modules:

```
urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-netconf-partial-lock

urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-netconf-state

urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-netconf
```

Note that a different URN prefix string SHOULD be used for non-Standards-Track modules. The string SHOULD be selected according to the guidelines in [RFC7950].

The following URIs exemplify what might be used by non Standards

Track modules. Note that the domain "example.com" SHOULD be used by example modules in IETF drafts.

Example URIs using URLs per RFC 3986 [RFC3986]:

http://example.com/ns/example-interfaces

http://example.com/ns/example-system

Example URIs using tags per RFC 4151 [RFC4151]:

tag:example.com,2017:example-interfaces

tag:example.com,2017:example-system

4.10. Top-Level Data Definitions

The top-level data organization SHOULD be considered carefully, in advance. Data model designers need to consider how the functionality for a given protocol or protocol family will grow over time.

The separation of configuration data and operational state SHOULD be considered carefully. It is sometimes useful to define separate top-level containers for configuration and non-configuration data. For some existing top-level data nodes, configuration data was not in scope, so only one container representing operational state was created. Refer to the Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA) [I-D.ietf-netmod-revised-datastores]. for details.

The number of top-level data nodes within a module SHOULD be minimized. It is often useful to retrieve related information within a single subtree. If data is too distributed, is becomes difficult to retrieve all at once.

The names and data organization SHOULD reflect persistent information, such as the name of a protocol. The name of the working group SHOULD NOT be used because this may change over time.

A mandatory database data definition is defined as a node that a client must provide for the database to be valid. The server is not required to provide a value.

Top-level database data definitions MUST NOT be mandatory. If a mandatory node appears at the top level, it will immediately cause the database to be invalid. This can occur when the server boots or when a module is loaded dynamically at runtime.

4.11. Data Types

Selection of an appropriate data type (i.e., built-in type, existing derived type, or new derived type) is very subjective, and therefore few requirements can be specified on that subject.

Data model designers SHOULD use the most appropriate built-in data type for the particular application.

The signed numeric data types (i.e., 'int8', 'int16', 'int32', and 'int64') SHOULD NOT be used unless negative values are allowed for the desired semantics.

4.11.1. Fixed Value Extensibility

If the set of values is fixed and the data type contents are controlled by a single naming authority, then an enumeration data type SHOULD be used.

```
leaf foo {
  type enumeration {
    enum one;
    enum two;
  }
}
```

If extensibility of enumerated values is required, then the 'identityref' data type SHOULD be used instead of an enumeration or other built-in type.

```
identity foo-type {
  description "Base for the extensible type";
}

identity one {
  base f:foo-type;
}
identity two {
  base f:foo-type;
}

leaf foo {
  type identityref {
    base f:foo-type;
  }
}
```

Note that any module can declare an identity with base "foo-type"

that is valid for the "foo" leaf. Identityref values are considered to be qualified names.

4.11.2. Patterns and Ranges

For string data types, if a machine-readable pattern can be defined for the desired semantics, then one or more pattern statements SHOULD be present. A single quoted string SHOULD be used to specify the pattern, since a double-quoted string can modify the content.

The following typedef from [RFC6991] demonstrates the proper use of the "pattern" statement:

```
typedef ipv4-address-no-zone {
  type inet:ipv4-address {
    pattern '[0-9\.]*';
  }
  ...
}
```

For string data types, if the length of the string is required to be bounded in all implementations, then a length statement MUST be present.

The following typedef from [RFC6991] demonstrates the proper use of the "length" statement:

```
typedef yang-identifier {
  type string {
    length "1..max";
    pattern '[a-zA-Z_][a-zA-Z0-9\-_.]*';
    pattern '.|..|[^xX].*|.[^mM].*|..[^lL].*';
  }
  ...
}
```

For numeric data types, if the values allowed by the intended semantics are different than those allowed by the unbounded intrinsic data type (e.g., 'int32'), then a range statement SHOULD be present.

The following typedef from [RFC6991] demonstrates the proper use of the "range" statement:

```
typedef dscp {
  type uint8 {
     range "0..63";
  }
  ...
```

```
    }
```

4.11.3. Enumerations and Bits

For 'enumeration' or 'bits' data types, the semantics for each 'enum' or 'bit' SHOULD be documented. A separate description statement (within each 'enum' or 'bit' statement) SHOULD be present.

```
    leaf foo {
      // INCORRECT
      type enumeration {
        enum one;
        enum two;
      }
      description
        "The foo enum...
         one: The first enum
         two: The second enum";
    }

    leaf foo {
      // CORRECT
      type enumeration {
        enum one {
          description "The first enum";
        }
        enum two {
          description "The second enum";
        }
      }
      description
        "The foo enum...  ";
    }
```

4.11.4. Union Types

The YANG "union" type is evaluated by testing a value against each member type in the union. The first type definition that accepts a value as valid is the member type used. In general, member types SHOULD be ordered from most restrictive to least restrictive types.

In the following example, the "enumeration" type will never be matched because the preceding "string" type will match everything.

Incorrect:

```
type union {
  type string;
  type enumeration {
    enum up;
    enum down;
  }
}
```

Correct:

```
type union {
  type enumeration {
    enum up;
    enum down;
  }
  type string;
}
```

It is possible for different member types to match, depending on the input encoding format. In XML, all values are passed as string nodes, but in JSON there are different value types for numbers, booleans, and strings.

In the following example, a JSON numeric value will always be matched by the "int32" type but in XML the string value representing a number will be matched by the "string" type. The second version will match the "int32" member type no matter how the input is encoded.

Incorrect:

```
type union {
  type string;
  type int32;
}
```

Correct:

```
type union {
  type int32;
  type string;
}
```

4.11.5. Empty and Boolean

YANG provides an "empty" data type, which has one value (i.e., present). The default is "not present", which is not actually a value. When used within a list key, only one value can (and must) exist for this key leaf. The type "empty" SHOULD NOT be used for a

key leaf since it is pointless.

There is really no difference between a leaf of type "empty" and a leaf-list of type "empty". Both are limited to one instance. The type "empty" SHOULD NOT be used for a leaf-list.

The advantage of using type "empty" instead of type "boolean" is that the default (not present) does not take up any bytes in a representation. The disadvantage is that the client may not be sure if an empty leaf is missing because it was filtered somehow or not implemented. The client may not have a complete and accurate schema for the data returned by the server, and not be aware of the missing leaf.

The YANG "boolean" data type provides two values ("true" and "false"). When used within a list key, two entries can exist for this key leaf. Default values are ignored for key leafs, but a default statement is often used for plain boolean leafs. The advantage of the "boolean" type is that the leaf or leaf-list has a clear representation for both values. The default value is usually not returned unless explicitly requested by the client, so no bytes are used in a typical representation.

In general, the "boolean" data type SHOULD be used instead of the "empty" data type, as shown in the example below:

Incorrect:

```
leaf flag1 {
  type empty;
}
```

Correct:

```
leaf flag2 {
  type boolean;
  default false;
}
```

4.12. Reusable Type Definitions

If an appropriate derived type exists in any standard module, such as [RFC6991], then it SHOULD be used instead of defining a new derived type.

If an appropriate units identifier can be associated with the desired semantics, then a units statement SHOULD be present.

If an appropriate default value can be associated with the desired semantics, then a default statement SHOULD be present.

If a significant number of derived types are defined, and it is anticipated that these data types will be reused by multiple modules, then these derived types SHOULD be contained in a separate module or submodule, to allow easier reuse without unnecessary coupling.

The description statement MUST be present.

If the type definition semantics are defined in an external document (other than another YANG module indicated by an import statement), then the reference statement MUST be present.

4.13. Reusable Groupings

A reusable grouping is a YANG grouping that can be imported by another module, and is intended for use by other modules. This is not the same as a grouping that is used within the module it is defined, but happens to be exportable to another module because it is defined at the top-level of the YANG module.

The following guidelines apply to reusable groupings, in order to make them as robust as possible:

- Clearly identify the purpose of the grouping in the "description" statement.

- There are 5 different XPath contexts in YANG (rpc/input, rpc/output, notification, config=true data nodes, and all data nodes). Clearly identify which XPath contexts are applicable or excluded for the grouping.

- Do not reference data outside the grouping in any "path", "must", or "when" statements.

- Do not include a "default" sub-statement on a leaf or choice unless the value applies on all possible contexts.

- Do not include a "config" sub-statement on a data node unless the value applies on all possible contexts.

- Clearly identify any external dependencies in the grouping "description" statement, such as nodes referenced by absolute path from a "path", "must", or "when" statement.

4.14. Data Definitions

The description statement MUST be present in the following YANG statements:

- anyxml
- augment
- choice
- container
- extension
- feature
- grouping
- identity
- leaf
- leaf-list
- list
- notification
- rpc
- typedef

If the data definition semantics are defined in an external document, (other than another YANG module indicated by an import statement), then a reference statement MUST be present.

The 'anyxml' construct may be useful to represent an HTML banner containing markup elements, such as '' and '', and MAY be used in such cases. However, this construct SHOULD NOT be used if other YANG data node types can be used instead to represent the desired syntax and semantics.

It has been found that the 'anyxml' statement is not implemented consistently across all servers. It is possible that mixed mode XML will not be supported, or configuration anyxml nodes will not supported.

If there are referential integrity constraints associated with the desired semantics that can be represented with XPath, then one or more 'must' statements SHOULD be present.

For list and leaf-list data definitions, if the number of possible instances is required to be bounded for all implementations, then the max-elements statements SHOULD be present.

If any 'must' or 'when' statements are used within the data definition, then the data definition description statement SHOULD describe the purpose of each one.

The "choice" statement is allowed to be directly present within a "case" statement in YANG 1.1. This needs to be considered carefully. Consider simply including the nested "choice" as additional "case" statements within the parent "choice" statement. Note that the "mandatory" and "default" statements within a nested "choice" statement only apply if the "case" containing the nested "choice" statement is first selected.

4.14.1. Non-Presence Containers

A non-presence container is used to organize data into specific subtrees. It is not intended to have semantics within the data model beyond this purpose, although YANG allows it (e.g., "must" statement within the non-presence container).

Example using container wrappers:

```
container top {
   container foos {
      list foo { ... }
   }
   container bars {
      list bar { ... }
   }
}
```

Example without container wrappers:

```
container top {
   list foo { ... }
   list bar { ... }
}
```

Use of non-presence containers to organize data is a subjective matter similar to use of sub-directories in a file system. The NETCONF and RESTCONF protocols do not currently support the ability

to delete all list (or leaf-list) entries at once. This deficiency is sometimes avoided by use of a parent container (i.e., deleting the container also removes all child entries).

4.14.2. Top-Level Data Nodes

Use of top-level objects needs to be considered carefully:

- top-level siblings are not ordered
- top-level siblings not are not static, and depends on the modules that are loaded
- for sub-tree filtering, retrieval of a top-level leaf-list will be treated as a content-match node for all top-level-siblings
- a top-level list with many instances may impact performance

4.15. Operation Definitions

If the operation semantics are defined in an external document (other than another YANG module indicated by an import statement), then a reference statement MUST be present.

If the operation impacts system behavior in some way, it SHOULD be mentioned in the description statement.

If the operation is potentially harmful to system behavior in some way, it MUST be mentioned in the Security Considerations section of the document.

4.16. Notification Definitions

The description statement MUST be present.

If the notification semantics are defined in an external document (other than another YANG module indicated by an import statement), then a reference statement MUST be present.

If the notification refers to a specific resource instance, then this instance SHOULD be identified in the notification data. This is usually done by including 'leafref' leaf nodes with the key leaf values for the resource instance. For example:

```
  notification interface-up {
    description "Sent when an interface is activated.";
    leaf name {
      type leafref {
        path "/if:interfaces/if:interface/if:name";
      }
    }
  }
```

Note that there are no formal YANG statements to identify any data node resources associated with a notification. The description statement for the notification SHOULD specify if and how the notification identifies any data node resources associated with the specific event.

4.17. Feature Definitions

The YANG "feature" statement is used to define a label for a set of optional functionality within a module. The "if-feature" statement is used in the YANG statements associated with a feature. The description-stmt within a feature-stmt MUST specify any interactions with other features.

The set of YANG features defined in a module should be considered carefully. Very fine granular features increase interoperability complexity and should be avoided. A likely misuse of the feature mechanism is the tagging of individual leafs (e.g., counters) with separate features.

If there is a large set of objects associated with a YANG feature, then consider moving those objects to a separate module, instead of using a YANG feature. Note that the set of features within a module is easily discovered by the reader, but the set of related modules within the entire YANG library is not as easy to identity. Module names with a common prefix can help readers identity the set of related modules, but this assumes the reader will have discovered and installed all the relevant modules.

Another consideration for deciding whether to create a new module or add a YANG feature is the stability of the module in question. It may be desirable to have a stable base module that is not changed frequently. If new functionality is placed in a separate module, then the base module does not need to be republished. If it is designed as a YANG feature then the module will need to be republished.

If one feature requires implementation of another feature, then an "if-feature" statement SHOULD be used in the dependent "feature"

statement.

For example, feature2 requires implementation of feature1:

```
feature feature1 {
  description "Some protocol feature";
}

feature feature2 {
  if-feature "feature1";
  description "Another protocol feature";
}
```

4.18. YANG Data Node Constraints

4.18.1. Controlling Quantity

The "min-elements" and "max-elements" statements can be use to control how many list or leaf-list instances are required for a particular data node. YANG constraint statements SHOULD be used to identify conditions that apply to all implementations of the data model. If platform-specific limitations (e.g., the "max-elements" supported for a particular list) are relevant to operations, then a data model definition statement (e.g., "max-ports" leaf) SHOULD be used to identify the limit.

4.18.2. must vs. when

The "must" and "when" YANG statements are used to provide cross-object referential tests. They have very different behavior. The "when" statement causes data node instances to be silently deleted as soon as the condition becomes false. A false "when" expression is not considered to be an error.

The "when" statement SHOULD be used together with the "augment" or "uses" statements to achieve conditional model composition. The condition SHOULD be based on static properties of the augmented entry (e.g., list key leafs).

The "must" statement causes a datastore validation error if the condition is false. This statement SHOULD be used for enforcing parameter value restrictions that involve more than one data node (e.g., end-time parameter must be after the start-time parameter).

4.19. Augment Statements

The YANG "augment" statement is used to define a set of data definition statements that will be added as child nodes of a target

data node. The module namespace for these data nodes will be the augmenting module, not the augmented module.

A top-level "augment" statement SHOULD NOT be used if the target data node is in the same module or submodule as the evaluated "augment" statement. The data definition statements SHOULD be added inline instead.

4.19.1. Conditional Augment Statements

The "augment" statement is often used together with the "when" statement and/or "if-feature" statement to make the augmentation conditional on some portion of the data model.

The following example from [RFC7223] shows how a conditional container called "ethernet" is added to the "interface" list only for entries of the type "ethernetCsmacd".

```
augment "/if:interfaces/if:interface" {
    when "if:type = 'ianaift:ethernetCsmacd'";

    container ethernet {
        leaf duplex {
            ...
        }
    }
}
```

4.19.2. Conditionally Mandatory Data Definition Statements

YANG has very specific rules about how configuration data can be updated in new releases of a module. These rules allow an "old client" to continue interoperating with a "new server".

If data nodes are added to an existing entry, the old client MUST NOT be required to provide any mandatory parameters that were not in the original module definition.

It is possible to add conditional augment statements such that the old client would not know about the new condition, and would not specify the new condition. The conditional augment statement can contain mandatory objects only if the condition is false unless explicitly requested by the client.

Only a conditional augment statement that uses the "when" statement form of condition can be used in this manner. The YANG features enabled on the server cannot be controlled by the client in any way, so it is not safe to add mandatory augmenting data nodes based on the

"if-feature" statement.

The XPath "when" statement condition MUST NOT reference data outside of target data node because the client does not have any control over this external data.

In the following dummy example, it is OK to augment the "interface" entry with "mandatory-leaf" because the augmentation depends on support for "some-new-iftype". The old client does not know about this type so it would never select this type, and therefore not be adding a mandatory data node.

```
  module example-module {
    namespace "http://example.com/ns/example-module";
    prefix mymod;

    import iana-if-type { prefix iana; }
    import ietf-interfaces { prefix if; }

    identity some-new-iftype {
       base iana:iana-interface-type;
    }

    augment "/if:interfaces/if:interface" {
       when "if:type = 'mymod:some-new-iftype'";

       leaf mandatory-leaf {
          mandatory true;
          ...
       }
    }
  }
```

Note that this practice is safe only for creating data resources. It is not safe for replacing or modifying resources if the client does not know about the new condition. The YANG data model MUST be packaged in a way that requires the client to be aware of the mandatory data nodes if it is aware of the condition for this data. In the example above, the "some-new-iftype" identity is defined in the same module as the "mandatory-leaf" data definition statement.

This practice is not safe for identities defined in a common module such as "iana-if-type" because the client is not required to know about "my-module" just because it knows about the "iana-if-type" module.

4.20. Deviation Statements

The YANG "deviation" statement cannot appear in IETF YANG modules, but it can be useful for documenting server capabilities. Deviation statements are not reusable and typically not shared across all platforms.

There are several reasons that deviations might be needed in an implementation, e.g., an object cannot be supported on all platforms, or feature delivery is done in multiple development phases. Deviation statements can also be used to add annotations to a module, which does not affect the conformance requirements for the module.

It is suggested that deviation statements be defined in separate modules from regular YANG definitions. This allows the deviations to be platform-specific and/or temporary.

The order that deviation statements are evaluated can affect the result. Therefore multiple deviation statements in the same module, for the same target object, SHOULD NOT be used.

The "max-elements" statement is intended to describe an architectural limit to the number of list entries. It is not intended to describe platform limitations. It is better to use a "deviation" statement for the platforms that have a hard resource limit.

Example documenting platform resource limits:

Wrong: (max-elements in the list itself)

```
container backups {
  list backup {
     ...
     max-elements  10;
     ...
  }
}
```

Correct: (max-elements in a deviation)

```
deviation /bk:backups/bk:backup {
  deviate add {
     max-elements  10;
  }
}
```

4.21. Extension Statements

The YANG "extension" statement is used to specify external definitions. This appears in the YANG syntax as an "unknown-statement". Usage of extension statements in a published module needs to be considered carefully.

The following guidelines apply to the usage of YANG extensions:

- The semantics of the extension MUST NOT contradict any YANG statements. Extensions can add semantics not covered by the normal YANG statements.

- The module containing the extension statement MUST clearly identify the conformance requirements for the extension. It should be clear whether all implementations of the YANG module containing the extension need to also implement the extension. If not, identify what conditions apply that would require implementation of the extension.

- The extension MUST clearly identify where it can be used within other YANG statements.

- The extension MUST clearly identify if YANG statements or other extensions are allowed or required within the extension as sub-statements.

4.22. Data Correlation

Data can be correlated in various ways, using common data types, common data naming, and common data organization. There are several ways to extend the functionality of a module, based on the degree of coupling between the old and new functionality:

- inline: update the module with new protocol-accessible objects. The naming and data organization of the original objects is used. The new objects are in the original module namespace.

- augment: create a new module with new protocol-accessible objects that augment the original data structure. The naming and data organization of the original objects is used. The new objects are in the new module namespace.

- mirror: create new objects in a new module or the original module, except use new a naming scheme and data location. The naming can be coupled in different ways. Tight coupling is achieved with a "leafref" data type, with the "require-instance" sub-statement set to "true". This method SHOULD be used.

If the new data instances are not limited to the values in use in the original data structure, then the "require-instance" sub-statement MUST be set to "false". Loose coupling is achieved by using key leafs with the same data type as the original data structure. This has the same semantics as setting the "require-instance" sub-statement to "false".

It is sometimes useful to separate configuration data and operational state, so that they do not not even share the exact same naming characteristics. The correlation between configuration the operational state that is affected by changes in configuration is a complex problem. There may not be a simple 1:1 relationship between a configuration data node and an operational state node. Further work is needed in YANG to clarify this relationship. Protocol work may also be needed to allow a client to retrieve this type of information from a server. At this time the best practice is to clearly document any relationship to other data structures in the "description" statement.

4.22.1. Use of Leafref for Key Correlation

Sometimes it is not practical to augment a data structure. For example, the correlated data could have different keys or contain mandatory nodes.

The following example shows the use of the "leafref" data type for data correlation purposes:

Not preferred:

```
   list foo {
      key name;
      leaf name {
        type string;
      }
      ...
   }

   list foo-addon {
      key name;
      config false;
      leaf name {
        type string;
      }
      ...
   }
```

Preferred:

```
   list foo {
      key name;
      leaf name {
        type string;
      }
      ...
   }

   list foo-addon {
      key name;
      config false;
      leaf name {
        type leafref {
          path "/foo/name";
          require-instance false;
        }
      }
      leaf addon {
        type string;
        mandatory true;
      }
   }
```

4.23. Operational State

The modeling of operational state with YANG has been refined over time. At first, only data that has a "config" statement value of "false" was considered to be operational state. This data was not considered to be part of any datastore, which made YANG XPath definition much more complicated.

Operational state is now modeled using YANG according to new NMDA, and is now conceptually contained in the operational state datastore, which also includes the operational values of configuration data. There is no longer any need to duplicate data structures to provide separate configuration and operational state sections.

This section describes some data modeling issues related to operational state, and guidelines for transitioning YANG data model design to be NMDA-compatible.

4.23.1. Combining Operational State and Configuration Data

If possible, operational state SHOULD be combined with its associated configuration data. This prevents duplication of key leafs and ancestor nodes. It also prevents race conditions for retrieval of dynamic entries, and allows configuration and operational state to be retrieved together with minimal message overhead.

```
container foo {
  ...
  // contains config=true and config=false nodes that have
  // no corresponding config=true object (e.g., counters)
}
```

4.23.2. Representing Operational Values of Configuration Data

If possible the same data type SHOULD be used to represent the configured value and the operational value, for a given leaf or leaf-list object.

Sometimes the configured value set is different than the operational value set for that object. For example, the "admin-state" and "oper-state" leafs in [RFC7223]. In this case a separate object MAY be used to represent the configured and operational values.

Sometimes the list keys are not identical for configuration data and the corresponding operational state. In this case separate lists MAY be used to represent the configured and operational values.

If it is not possible to combine configuration and operational state, then the keys used to represent list entries SHOULD be the same type. The "leafref" data type SHOULD be used in operational state for key leafs that have corresponding configuration instances. The "require-instance" statement MAY be set to "false" (in YANG 1.1 modules only) to indicate instances are allowed in the operational state that do not exist in the associated configuration data.

The need to replicate objects or define different operational state objects depends on the data model. It is not possible to define one approach that will be optimal for all data models.

Designers SHOULD describe and justify any NMDA exceptions in detail, such as the use of separate subtrees and/or separate leafs. The "description" statements for both the configuration and the operational state SHOULD be used for this purpose.

4.23.3. NMDA Transition Guidelines

YANG modules SHOULD be designed assuming they will be used on servers supporting the operational state datastore. With this in mind, YANG modules SHOULD define config "false" wherever they make sense to the data model. Config "false" nodes SHOULD NOT be defined to provide the operational value for configuration nodes, except when the value space of a configured and operational values may differ, in which case a distinct config "false" node SHOULD be defined to hold the operational value for the configured node.

The following guidelines are meant to help modelers develop YANG modules that will maximize the utility of the model with both current and new implementations.

New modules and modules that are not concerned with the operational state of configuration information SHOULD immediately be structured to be NMDA-compatible, as described in Section 4.23.1. This transition MAY be deferred if the module does not contain any configuration datastore objects.

The remaining are options that MAY be followed during the time that NMDA mechanisms are being defined.

(a) Modules that require immediate support for the NMDA features SHOULD be structured for NMDA. A temporary non-NMDA version of this type of module MAY exist, either an existing model or a model created either by hand or with suitable tools that mirror the current modeling strategies. Both the NMDA and the non-NMDA modules SHOULD be published in the same document, with NMDA modules in the document main body and the non-NMDA modules in a non-normative appendix. The use of the non-NMDA module will allow temporary bridging of the time period until NMDA implementations are available.

(b) For published models, the model should be republished with an NMDA-compatible structure, deprecating non-NMDA constructs. For example, the "ietf-interfaces" model in [RFC7223] has been restructured as an NMDA-compatible model in [I-D.ietf-netmod-rfc7223bis]. The "/interfaces-state" hierarchy has been marked "status deprecated". Models that mark their "/foo-state" hierarchy with "status deprecated" will allow NMDA-capable implementations to avoid the cost of duplicating the state nodes, while enabling non-NMDA-capable implementations to utilize them for access to the operational values.

(c) For models that augment models which have not been structured with the NMDA, the modeler will have to consider the structure of the base model and the guidelines listed above. Where possible, such models should move to new revisions of the base model that are NMDA-compatible. When that is not possible, augmenting "state" containers SHOULD be avoided, with the expectation that the base model will be re-released with the state containers marked as deprecated. It is RECOMMENDED to augment only the "/foo" hierarchy of the base model. Where this recommendation cannot be followed, then any new "state" elements SHOULD be included in their own module.

4.23.3.1. Temporary non-NMDA Modules

A temporary non-NMDA module allows a non-NMDA aware client to access operational state from an NMDA-compliant server. It contains the top-level config=false data nodes that would have been defined in a legacy YANG module (before NMDA).

A server that needs to support both NMDA and non-NMDA clients can advertise both the new NMDA module and the temporary non-NMDA module. A non-NMDA client can use separate "foo" and "foo-state" subtrees, except the "foo-state" subtree is located in a different (temporary) module. The NMDA module can be used by a non-NMDA client to access the conventional configuration datastores, and the deprecated <get> operation to access nested config=false data nodes.

To create the temporary non-NMDA model from an NMDA model, the following steps can be taken:

- Change the module name by appending "-state" to the original module name
- Change the namespace by appending "-state" to the original namespace value
- Change the prefix by appending "-s" to the original prefix value
- Add an import to the original module (e.g., for typedef definitions)
- Retain or create only the top-level nodes that have a "config" statement value "false". These subtrees represent config=false data nodes that were combined into the configuration subtree, and therefore not available to non-NMDA aware clients. Set the "status" statement to "deprecated" for each new node.
- The module description SHOULD clearly identify the module as a temporary non-NMDA module

4.23.3.2. Example: Create a New NMDA Module

Create an NMDA-compliant module, using combined configuration and state subtrees, whenever possible.

```
    module example-foo {
      namespace "urn:example.com:params:xml:ns:yang:example-foo";
      prefix "foo";

      container foo {
        // configuration data child nodes
        // operational value in operational state datastore only
        // may contain config=false nodes as needed
      }
    }
```

4.23.3.3. Example: Convert an old Non-NMDA Module

Do not remove non-compliant objects from existing modules. Instead, change the status to "deprecated". At some point, usually after 1 year, the status MAY be changed to "obsolete".

Old Module:

```
    module example-foo {
      namespace "urn:example.com:params:xml:ns:yang:example-foo";
      prefix "foo";

      container foo {
        // configuration data child nodes
      }

      container foo-state {
        config false;
        // operational state child nodes
      }
    }
```

Converted NMDA Module:

```
    module example-foo {
      namespace "urn:example.com:params:xml:ns:yang:example-foo";
      prefix "foo";

      container foo {
        // configuration data child nodes
        // operational value in operational state datastore only
        // may contain config=false nodes as needed
        // will contain any data nodes from old foo-state
      }

      // keep original foo-state but change status to deprecated
      container foo-state {
        config false;
        status deprecated;
        // operational state child nodes
      }
   }
```

4.23.3.4. Example: Create a Temporary NMDA Module:

Create a new module that contains the top-level operational state data nodes that would have been available before they were combined with configuration data nodes (to be NMDA compliant).

```
    module example-foo-state {
      namespace "urn:example.com:params:xml:ns:yang:example-foo-state";
      prefix "foo-s";

      // import new or converted module; not used in this example
      import example-foo { prefix foo; }

      container foo-state {
        config false;
        status deprecated;
        // operational state child nodes
      }
   }
```

4.24. Performance Considerations

It is generally likely that certain YANG statements require more runtime resources than other statements. Although there are no performance requirements for YANG validation, the following information MAY be considered when designing YANG data models:

- Lists are generally more expensive than containers
- "when-stmt" evaluation is generally more expensive than "if-feature" or "choice" statements
- "must" statement is generally more expensive than "min-entries", "max-entries", "mandatory", or "unique" statements
- "identityref" leafs are generally more expensive than "enumeration" leafs
- "leafref" and "instance-identifier" types with "require-instance" set to true are generally more expensive than if "require-instance" is set to false

4.25. Open Systems Considerations

A YANG module MUST NOT be designed such that the set of modules found on a server implementation can be predetermined in advance. Only the modules imported by a particular module can be assumed to be present in an implementation. An open system MAY include any combination of YANG modules.

4.26. YANG 1.1 Guidelines

The set of YANG 1.1 guidelines will grow as operational experience is gained with the new language features. This section contains an initial set of guidelines.

4.26.1. Importing Multiple Revisions

Standard modules SHOULD NOT import multiple revisions of the same module into a module. This MAY be done if the authors can demonstrate that the "avoided" definitions from the most recent of the multiple revisions are somehow broken or harmful to interoperability.

4.26.2. Using Feature Logic

The YANG 1.1 feature logic is much more expressive than YANG 1.0. A "description" statement SHOULD describe the "if-feature" logic in text, to help readers understand the module.

YANG features SHOULD be used instead of the "when" statement, if possible. Features are advertised by the server and objects conditional by if-feature are conceptually grouped together. There is no such commonality supported for "when" statements.

Features generally require less server implementation complexity and runtime resources than objects that use "when" statements. Features are generally static (i.e., set when module is loaded and not changed at runtime). However every client edit might cause a "when" statement result to change.

4.26.3. anyxml vs. anydata

The "anyxml" statement MUST NOT be used to represent a conceptual subtree of YANG data nodes. The "anydata" statement MUST be used for this purpose.

4.26.4. action vs. rpc

The use of "action" statements or "rpc" statements is a subjective design decision. RPC operations are not associated with any particular data node. Actions are associated with a specific data node definition. An "action" statement SHOULD be used if the protocol operation is specific to a subset of all data nodes instead of all possible data nodes.

The same action name MAY be used in different definitions within different data node. For example, a "reset" action defined with a data node definition for an interface might have different parameters than for a power supply or a VLAN. The same action name SHOULD be used to represent similar semantics.

The NETCONF Access Control Model (NACM) [RFC6536] does not support parameter access control for RPC operations. The user is given permission (or not) to invoke the RPC operation with any parameters. For example, if each client is only allowed to reset their own interface, then NACM cannot be used.

For example, NACM cannot enforce access access control based on the value of the "interface" parameter, only the "reset" operation itself:

```
rpc reset {
  input {
    leaf interface {
      type if:interface-ref;
      mandatory true;
      description "The interface to reset.";
    }
  }
}
```

However, NACM can enforce access access control for individual

interface instances, using a "reset" action, If the user does not have read access to the specific "interface" instance, then it cannot invoke the "reset" action for that interface instance:

```
container interfaces {
  list interface {
    ...
    action reset { }
  }
}
```

4.27. Updating YANG Modules (Published vs. Unpublished)

YANG modules can change over time. Typically, new data model definitions are needed to support new features. YANG update rules defined in section 11 of [RFC7950] MUST be followed for published modules. They MAY be followed for unpublished modules.

The YANG update rules only apply to published module revisions. Each organization will have their own way to identify published work which is considered to be stable, and unpublished work which is considered to be unstable. For example, in the IETF, the RFC document is used for published work, and the Internet-Draft is used for unpublished work.

5. IANA Considerations

-- RFC Ed: These registries need to be updated to reference this RFC instead of RFC 6087 for the ietf-template module, and remove this note.

This document registers one URI in the IETF XML registry [RFC3688].

The following registration has been made in [RFC6087] and updated by this document.

URI: urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-template

Registrant Contact: The IESG.

XML: N/A, the requested URI is an XML namespace.

The following assignment has been made in [RFC6087] and updated by this document in the YANG Module Names Registry, or the YANG module template in Appendix C.

Field	Value
Name	ietf-template
Namespace	urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-template
Prefix	temp
Reference	RFC XXXX

YANG Registry Assignment

6. Security Considerations

This document defines documentation guidelines for NETCONF or RESTCONF content defined with the YANG data modeling language, and therefore does not introduce any new or increased security risks into the management system.

7. Acknowledgments

The structure and contents of this document are adapted from [RFC4181], guidelines for MIB Documents, by C. M. Heard.

The working group thanks Martin Bjorklund, Juergen Schoenwaelder, Ladislav Lhotka, Jernej Tuljak, and Lou Berger for their extensive reviews and contributions to this document.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

[RFC3688] Mealling, M., "The IETF XML Registry", BCP 81, RFC 3688, January 2004.

[RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, RFC 3986, January 2005.

[RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", RFC 5246, DOI 10.17487/RFC5246, August 2008, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5246>.

[RFC5378] Bradner, S. and J. Contreras, "Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust", BCP 78, RFC 5378, November 2008.

[RFC6020] Bjorklund, M., "YANG - A Data Modeling Language for the Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6020, October 2010.

[RFC7950] Bjorklund, M., Ed., "The YANG 1.1 Data Modeling Language", RFC 7950, DOI 10.17487/RFC7950, August 2016, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7950>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>.

[W3C.REC-xpath-19991116] Clark, J. and S. DeRose, "XML Path Language (XPath) Version 1.0", World Wide Web Consortium Recommendation REC-xpath-19991116, November 1999, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1999/REC-xpath-19991116>.

8.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-netmod-revised-datastores] Bjorklund, M., Schoenwaelder, J., Shafer, P., Watsen, K., and R. Wilton, "Network Management Datastore Architecture", draft-ietf-netmod-revised-datastores-10 (work in progress), January 2018.

[I-D.ietf-netmod-rfc7223bis]
Bjorklund, M., "A YANG Data Model for Interface Management", draft-ietf-netmod-rfc7223bis-03 (work in progress), January 2018.

[I-D.ietf-netmod-rfc8022bis]
Lhotka, L., Lindem, A., and Y. Qu, "A YANG Data Model for Routing Management (NMDA Version)", draft-ietf-netmod-rfc8022bis-11 (work in progress), January 2018.

[I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-tree-diagrams]
Bjorklund, M. and L. Berger, "YANG Tree Diagrams", draft-ietf-netmod-yang-tree-diagrams-05 (work in progress), January 2018.

[RFC-STYLE]
Braden, R., Ginoza, S., and A. Hagens, "RFC Document Style", September 2009, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc-style-guide/rfc-style>.

[RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, DOI 10.17487/RFC2026, October 1996, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>.

[RFC4151] Kindberg, T. and S. Hawke, "The 'tag' URI Scheme", RFC 4151, DOI 10.17487/RFC4151, October 2005, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4151>.

[RFC4181] Heard, C., "Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers of MIB Documents", BCP 111, RFC 4181, September 2005.

[RFC6087] Bierman, A., "Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers of YANG Data Model Documents", RFC 6087, January 2011.

[RFC6241] Enns, R., Ed., Bjorklund, M., Ed., Schoenwaelder, J., Ed., and A. Bierman, Ed., "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6241, June 2011.

[RFC6242] Wasserman, M., "Using the NETCONF Protocol over Secure Shell (SSH)", RFC 6242, DOI 10.17487/RFC6242, June 2011, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6242>.

[RFC6536] Bierman, A. and M. Bjorklund, "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) Access Control Model", RFC 6536, March 2012.

[RFC6991] Schoenwaelder, J., "Common YANG Data Types", RFC 6991,

July 2013.

[RFC7223] Bjorklund, M., "A YANG Data Model for Interface Management", RFC 7223, May 2014.

[RFC7322] Flanagan, H. and S. Ginoza, "RFC Style Guide", RFC 7322, DOI 10.17487/RFC7322, September 2014, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7322>.

[RFC7841] Halpern, J., Ed., Daigle, L., Ed., and O. Kolkman, Ed., "RFC Streams, Headers, and Boilerplates", RFC 7841, DOI 10.17487/RFC7841, May 2016, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7841>.

[RFC8040] Bierman, A., Bjorklund, M., and K. Watsen, "RESTCONF Protocol", RFC 8040, DOI 10.17487/RFC8040, January 2017, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8040>.

[RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 8126, DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>.

Appendix A. Change Log

-- RFC Ed.: remove this section before publication.

A.1. v15 to v16

- address Area Director review comments posted 2018-01-25

A.2. v15 to v16

- address document shephard comments posted 2018-01-15
- add yang-version to template module

A.3. v14 to v15

- changed Intended status from Informational to BCP
- update tree diagram guidelines section
- Change IANA template to list IESG instead of NETMOD WG as the Registrant
- Update some references

A.4. v13 to v14

- Replaced sec. 4.23 Operational Data with Operational Data from NMDA text by Lou Berger and Kent Watsen
- Added NMDA Terms section
- Changed term operational data to operational state
- Clarified that reference-stmt SHOULD be present in import-stmt

A.5. v12 to v13

- Clarify that the revision-date SHOULD be used in a CODE BEGINS YANG file extraction macro.
- Clarify the IANA requirements section wrt/ XML namespace and YANG module name registries.
- Clarify YANG Usage section wrt/ XML and/or JSON encoding format.
- Update Operation Data section to consider revised datastores.

- Add reference to YANG Tree Diagrams and update 2 sections that use this reference.
- Add reference to Revised Datastores and guidelines drafts

A.6. v11 to v12

- fix incorrect location of new Module Usage Examples section

A.7. v10 to v11

- updated YANG tree diagram syntax to align with pyang 1.7.1
- added general guideline to include module usage examples

A.8. v09 to v10

- clarified <CODE BEGINS> is only for normative modules
- clarified example module namespace URI conventions
- clarified pyang usage for normative and example modules
- updated YANG tree diagrams section with text from RFC 8022

A.9. v08 to v09

- fixed references
- added mention of RESTCONF to abstract and intro
- created separate section for code components
- fixed document status

A.10. v07 to v08

- changed CODE BEGINS guideline for example modules
- updated tree diagram guidelines
- clarified published and unpublished terms
- added section on Empty and Boolean data types
- clarified how to update the revision statement

- updated operational state guidelines
- added 'YANG fragment' to terminology section

A.11. v06 to v07

- update contact statement guideline
- update example modules guidelines
- add guidelines on top-level data nodes
- add guideline on use of NP containers
- added guidelines on union types
- add guideline on deviations
- added section on open systems considerations
- added guideline about definitions reserved for future use

A.12. v05 to v06

- Changed example 'my-module' to 'example-module'
- Added section Updating YANG Modules (Published vs. Unpublished)
- Added Example Modules section
- Added "<EXAMPLE BEGINS>" convention for full example modules
- Added section on using action vs. rpc
- Changed term "operational state" to "operational data"
- Added section on YANG Data Node Constraints
- Added guidelines on using must vs. when statements
- Made ietf-foo module validate for I-D submission

A.13. v04 to v05

- Clarified that YANG 1.1 SHOULD be used but YANG 1.0 MAY be used if no YANG 1.1 features needed

- Changed SHOULD follow YANG naming conventions to MUST follow (for standards track documents only)

- Clarified module naming conventions for normative modules, example modules, and modules from other SDOs.

- Added prefix value selection guidelines

- Added new section on guidelines for reusable groupings

- Made header guidelines less IETF-specific

- Added new section on guidelines for extension statements

- Added guidelines for nested "choice" statement within a "case" statement

A.14. v03 ot v04

- Added sections for deviation statements and performance considerations

- Added YANG 1.1 section

- Updated YANG reference from 1.0 to 1.1

A.15. v02 to v03

- Updated draft based on github data tracker issues added by Benoit Clause (Issues 12 - 18)

A.16. v01 to v02

- Updated draft based on mailing list comments.

A.17. v00 to v01

All issues from the issue tracker have been addressed.

https://github.com/netmod-wg/rfc6087bis/issues

- Issue 1: Tree Diagrams: Added 'tree-diagrams' section so RFCs with YANG modules can use an Informative reference to this RFC for tree diagrams. Updated guidelines to reference this RFC when tree diagrams are used

- Issue 2: XPath function restrictions: Added paragraphs in XPath usage section for 'id', 'namespace-uri', 'name', and 'lang'

functions

- Issue 3: XPath function document order issues: Added paragraph in XPath usage section about node-set ordering for 'local-name', 'namespace-uri', 'name', 'string' and 'number' functions. Also any function that implicitly converts a node-set to a string.

- Issue 4: XPath preceding-sibling and following-sibling: Checked and text in XPath usage section already has proposed text from Lada.

- Issue 5: XPath 'when-stmt' reference to descendant nodes: Added exception and example in XPath Usage section for augmented nodes.

- Issue 6: XPath numeric conversions: Changed 'numeric expressions' to 'numeric and boolean expressions'

- Issue 7: XPath module containment: Added sub-section on XPath wildcards

- Issue 8: status-stmt usage: Added text to Lifecycle Management section about transitioning from active to deprecated and then to obsolete.

- Issue 9: resource identification in notifications: Add text to Notifications section about identifying resources and using the leafref data type.

- Issue 10: single quoted strings: Added text to Data Types section about using a single-quoted string for patterns.

Appendix B. Module Review Checklist

This section is adapted from RFC 4181.

The purpose of a YANG module review is to review the YANG module both for technical correctness and for adherence to IETF documentation requirements. The following checklist may be helpful when reviewing an Internet-Draft:

- I-D Boilerplate -- verify that the draft contains the required Internet-Draft boilerplate (see http://www.ietf.org/id-info/guidelines.html), including the appropriate statement to permit publication as an RFC, and that I-D boilerplate does not contain references or section numbers.

- Abstract -- verify that the abstract does not contain references, that it does not have a section number, and that its content follows the guidelines in http://www.ietf.org/id-info/guidelines.html.

- Copyright Notice -- verify that the draft has the appropriate text regarding the rights that document contributers provide to the IETF Trust [RFC5378]. Verify that it contains the full IETF Trust copyright notice at the beginning of the document. The IETF Trust Legal Provisions (TLP) can be found at:

  http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/

- Security Considerations section -- verify that the draft uses the latest approved template from the OPS area website (http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/ops/trac/wiki/yang-security-guidelines) and that the guidelines therein have been followed.

- IANA Considerations section -- this section must always be present. For each module within the document, ensure that the IANA Considerations section contains entries for the following IANA registries:

  XML Namespace Registry: Register the YANG module namespace.

  YANG Module Registry: Register the YANG module name, prefix, namespace, and RFC number, according to the rules specified in [RFC7950].

- References -- verify that the references are properly divided between normative and informative references, that RFC 2119 is included as a normative reference if the terminology defined therein is used in the document, that all references required by the boilerplate are present, that all YANG modules containing imported items are cited as normative references, and that all citations point to the most current RFCs unless there is a valid reason to do otherwise (for example, it is OK to include an informative reference to a previous version of a specification to help explain a feature included for backward compatibility). Be sure citations for all imported modules are present somewhere in the document text (outside the YANG module).

- License -- verify that the draft contains the Simplified BSD License in each YANG module or submodule. Some guidelines related to this requirement are described in Section 3.1. Make sure that the correct year is used in all copyright dates. Use the approved text from the latest Trust Legal Provisions (TLP) document, which can be found at:

  http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/

- Other Issues -- check for any issues mentioned in http://www.ietf.org/id-info/checklist.html that are not covered elsewhere.

- Technical Content -- review the actual technical content for compliance with the guidelines in this document. The use of a YANG module compiler is recommended when checking for syntax errors. A list of freely available tools and other information can be found at:

  http://trac.tools.ietf.org/wg/netconf/trac/wiki

  Checking for correct syntax, however, is only part of the job. It is just as important to actually read the YANG module document from the point of view of a potential implementor. It is particularly important to check that description statements are sufficiently clear and unambiguous to allow interoperable implementations to be created.

Appendix C. YANG Module Template

```
<CODE BEGINS> file "ietf-template@2016-03-20.yang"

   module ietf-template {

     yang-version 1.1;

     // replace this string with a unique namespace URN value
     namespace
       "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-template";

     // replace this string, and try to pick a unique prefix
     prefix "temp";

     // import statements here: e.g.,
     // import ietf-yang-types { prefix yang; }
     // import ietf-inet-types { prefix inet; }

     // identify the IETF working group if applicable
     organization
        "IETF NETMOD (NETCONF Data Modeling Language) Working Group";

     // update this contact statement with your info
     contact
        "WG Web:   <http://tools.ietf.org/wg/your-wg-name/>
         WG List:  <mailto:your-wg-name@ietf.org>

         Editor:   your-name
                   <mailto:your-email@example.com>";


     // replace the first sentence in this description statement.
     // replace the copyright notice with the most recent
     // version, if it has been updated since the publication
     // of this document
     description
      "This module defines a template for other YANG modules.

       Copyright (c) <insert year> IETF Trust and the persons
       identified as authors of the code.  All rights reserved.

       Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or
       without modification, is permitted pursuant to, and subject
       to the license terms contained in, the Simplified BSD License
       set forth in Section 4.c of the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions
       Relating to IETF Documents
       (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info).
```

```
          This version of this YANG module is part of RFC XXXX; see
          the RFC itself for full legal notices.";

        // RFC Ed.: replace XXXX with actual RFC number and remove
        // this note

        reference "RFC XXXX";


        // RFC Ed.: remove this note
        // Note: extracted from RFC XXXX


        // replace '2016-03-20' with the module publication date
        // The format is (year-month-day)
        revision "2016-03-20" {
          description "what changed in this revision";
          reference "document containing this module";
        }

        // extension statements

        // feature statements

        // identity statements

        // typedef statements

        // grouping statements

        // data definition statements

        // augment statements

        // rpc statements

        // notification statements

        // DO NOT put deviation statements in a published module

      }
```

<CODE ENDS>

Author's Address

Andy Bierman
YumaWorks

Email: andy@yumaworks.com