

Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers of Documents Containing YANG Data Models

[draft-boucadair-netmod-rfc8407bis-01](#)

IETF#117, July 2023

Mohamed Boucadair (Orange) & Qin Wu (Huawei)

Motivation

- RFC8704 *does not cover guidelines for IANA-* maintained modules
 - Many authors are asking recurrent questions about how to proceed
 - Inconsistent approaches
- An *absolute recommendation is broken* for abstract data structures
- The *Trust* raised an issue about lack of code markers for the security template

Major Changes vs. RFC8704

- Added *guidelines for IANA-maintained* modules
- Added statements that the security template is *not required for modules that follow RFC 8791: Relax a MUST in 8704*
- *Updated the YANG security* considerations template to reflect the latest version maintained in the Wiki
- Added a statement that the *RFCs that are listed in the security template are to be listed as normative* references in documents that use the template

Minor Changes vs. RFC8704

- *Added code markers for the security template* ← Address the Trust issue
- Implemented errata 5693, 5800, 6899, and 7416
- Updated the terminology with new terms, e.g., IANA-maintained module
- Added a note that folding of the examples should be done as per RFC 8792 conventions
- Added a note that RFC 8792-folding of YANG modules can be used if and only if native YANG features (e.g., break line, "+") are not sufficient
- Added a similar note for the tree structures
- Updated many examples to be aligned with the consistent indentation recommendation
- Updated the IANA considerations to encourage registration requests to indicate whether a module is maintained by IANA or not

Very Minor Changes vs. RFC8704

- Updated the URL of the IETF authors guidelines
- Added tool validation checks of JSON-encoded examples
- Added tool validation checks to ensure that YANG modules fit into the line limits of an I-D

Pending Change

- Update the statement about the security template to also be relaxed when a module is about abstract data and cite RFC 7952 as another example
 - Other exceptions to be listed there?

Summary & Next Steps

- The proposed –bis addresses many of the recurrent issues raised by YANG module authors
 - An absolute requirement is broken as YANG is used as transport-agnostic language
 - Can't be fixed with an erratum
 - Updating the Guidelines to cover missing areas for better consistency among YANG modules
- Consider adopting the document with the following -bis scope
 - IANA Guidelines + errata + Trust issue
i.e.,
 - draft-boucadair-netmod-iana-registries + + errata + Trust issue
- Thoughts?