# YANG Data Model for DHCPv6 Configuration

draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-yang-06

Y. Cui, L. Sun, I. Farrer, S. Zechlin, **Z. He** IETF101 London

## What's happened since IETF100?

- Pretty much progress since v04!
- An issue tracker has started on github (thanks for lan and DHC co-chairs)
- Two versions (v05 & v06) have been published
- Resolved most issues from
  - Ian
  - Bernie
  - Marcin Siodelski

## Structural changes

- Split the monolithic model into five modules
  - server, relay, client, options, types
- Separated configuration data and state data
  - 'server/relay/client-config'
  - 'server/relay/client-state'
- Slimmed 'network-range' structure
  - 'address-pools', 'pd-pools' and 'host-reservations'
  - 'reserv-addresses' and 'reserv-prefixes' merged into 'host-reservations'
- Remodelled 'DUID' definition
  - 4 types defined in 3315bis and a 'duid-unknown' type

## **Detailed changes**

- Addressed the utilization issue
  - 'max-address-count' & 'allocated-address-count'
  - 'max-pd-space-utilization' & 'pd-space-utilization'
- Used 'feature' to indicate support for each option
- Moved 'rapid-commit' to address/pd-pool
- Removed some unnecessary 'boolean' nodes
  - 'pd-function', 'stateless-service', 'inherit-option-set'
- Added some interactions with 'ietf-interfaces'
  - interfaces-config\* if: interface-ref
- Checked most modeling of options

#### **Current Model Structure**



#### View Tree Model

Start at <u>https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-yang/</u> and click on links in Additional URLs section



## **Outstanding** Issues

- Unconventional DUID
  - opaque values or a new 'duid-unknown' type?
- Re-location of DUID and rapid-commit
  - DUID in 'server-attributes' or options?
  - 'rapid-commit' in 'address/pd-pool' or options?

## **Outstanding Issues**

- Serving requests from correct address/prefix pool
  - add 'client-class' under 'address/pd-pool'
  - the pool will only serve those clients that fall into this class
  - server gets to know client class from vendor class option (the way Kea does)
  - client classification too complicated (from Bernie)?
  - or do we need to define such a logic or not?

```
+--rw address-pools
| +--rw address-pool* [pool-id]
| | +--rw client-class? string
```

#### Next steps

- Continue to work on issues on github (hope more volunteers/contributors would fork the repo and get involved)
- Further check the correctness and completeness of option definitions
- Need input from vendors
- Any other comments/suggestions?