

CORECONF status

Carsten Bormann, CoRE@IETF110, 2021-03-12

The four CORECONF documents

- Yang-cbor, Sid: In IETF Last Call (ends 2021-03-17), reviews TBD except:
 - secdir/yang-cbor (Shawn Emery): No security cons, and that is alright so.
- Comi, Yang-library: In WG, waiting for shepherd writeup (yours truly)
 - Comi: shepherd's comments, waiting for WG input and resolution
 - Yang-library: next

Core-sid comment

- Ben Kaduk (Security AD) upon the start of the last-call (well-observed):
 - This appears (on quick skim) to be a proposal to create a registry and assign globally unique uint64 values to items in (unrelated) YANG modules.
 - In a sense this would be a **new global naming system** and as such might have some unexpected properties. Please send comments to last-call@ as usual, if you take a look.
- This is indeed the intention, and core-sid has been carefully designed to fill this role. Looking forward to more security thinking about this!

Comi comments and issues (1)

- Issue in netmod: Type equivalence
 - Comi currently assumes e.g. uint8 is incompatible (NBC) with int8 by assigning different encodings in URI
 - This incompatibility seems to be held up in current netmod discussion
 - Still, do we need to **rely** on it?
 - No rationale for inconsistencies given in draft

Comi URI encoding of YANG data

YANG datatype	Uri-Query text content
uint8, uint16, uint32, uint64	<code>int2str(key)</code>
int8, int16, int32, int64	<code>urlSafeBase64(CBORencode(key))</code>
decimal64	<code>urlSafeBase64(CBOR key)</code>
string	<code>key</code>
boolean	"0" or "1"
enumeration	<code>int2str(key)</code>
bits	<code>urlSafeBase64(CBORencode(key))</code>
binary	<code>urlSafeBase64(key)</code>
identityref	<code>int2str(key)</code>
union	<code>urlSafeBase64(CBORencode(key))</code>
instance-identifier	<code>urlSafeBase64(CBORencode(key))</code>

- String may not be URL-safe
- Why uint≠int
 - Identityref, enumeration probably OK
- What is “CBOR key”?
- key vs. `CBORencode(key)`

Comi comments and issues (2)

- Text about block-wise transfers (§ 5) does not really add anything
 - All that is probably needed is a short mention of the need for attention
- Making pagination a SHOULD for /.well-known/core needs to indicate:
 - How this is done (it is defined in CoRE RD § 6, but **not** for /wkc)
 - When can that SHOULD be violated?
 - (Note that there is a general YANG problem here, too;
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-wwlh-netconf-list-pagination-nc-01> ?)

Comi comments and issues (3)

Nits

- SID encoding: 0 → A (and not the empty string)
- New yang module version needed after update of documentation reference from RFC 7049 to RFC 8949?
- 4.01 vs. 4.03 confusion