

IETF 103

NETMOD

Working Group

- Chairs: Kent Watsen kwatsen@juniper.net
- Lou Berger lberger@labn.net
- Joel Jaeggli joelja@bogus.com
- Secretary: Zitao Wang wangzitao@huawei.com

- Online Agenda and Slide: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/103/session/netmod>
- Data tracker: <http://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/netmod/>
- Tools: <http://tools.ietf.org/wg/netmod>

Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

Also see: <http://www.ietf.org/about/note-well.html>:

Administrative

- Audio/Meetecho Streaming/Recording
 - Please speak only using the microphones
 - Please state your name before speaking
- Bluesheets, Note takers, Jabber scribes
- Minute takers & Etherpad
 - <http://etherpad.tools.ietf.org:9000/p/notes-ietf-103-netmod>
- Online Agenda and Slides at:
 - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/103/session/netmod>
- Data tracker: <http://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/netmod/>
- Tools: <http://tools.ietf.org/wg/netmod>



Sessions

- Session 2:
 - THURSDAY, November 8, 2018
 - 1610-1810 Afternoon Session II
 - Chitlada 2

Agenda: Session 2

Slot	Time	Duration	Information
1	16:10	10	Title: Intro Presenter: Chairs Draft:
12	16:20	20	Title: YANG Module Tags Presenter: Chris Hopps Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-netmod-module-tags-03
13	16:40	30	Title: YANG Versioning Requirements Presenter: Joe Clarke (representing YANG Versioning DT) Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-verdt-netmod-yang-versioning-reqs-01
14	17:10	50	Title: YANG Versioning Potential Solutions Presenter: Rob Wilton (representing YANG Versioning DT) Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-verdt-netmod-yang-solutions-00
15	18:00	10	Title: YANG model for finite state machine Presenter: Nicola Sambo (remote) Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-sambo-netmod-yang-fsm-04
Adjourn	18:10		

Extra Slides

Module Tags

- Do we need proscriptive language to describe how module tags are expected to be used?
- Recognizing that:
 - User tags may be used for effectively any purpose.
 - That IETF tags are subject to consensus call.
 - That the prefix registry is (as written) specification required.

Statements prompting this question in WGLC

Juergen

I do not like this. YANG has extension statements and having to parse stuff out of free text description statements seems to be a movement backwards.

Christian

This is used by the human implementer of the module (i.e., they need to write code to implement the module). As such it was not intended for machine parsing.

Juergen

I am personally not convinced. The whole reason why we have YANG is automation and I believe people will go and write tools to extract tags and having to extract them out of free form text looks like a step backwards.

Andy

It is more than a step backwards. There is an unexplained procedure for declaring the module-tag conformance, in addition to the module-tag mappings.

Alex

I have no issue with systems using tags to classify or organize modules, however this seems to me like something that would be specific to the system doing the classifying. It would not be something that needs to be specified in the module itself (except perhaps as freeform description text), and it certainly would not need to involve the NETCONF server. What would a server do with module classification data? (unless it is also implementing some kind of module browsing interface, in which case it might be used to supply the browser with data)