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Document status

• Adopted in November 2022
  • Describes how a management client and server handle YANG-modeled configuration data that is defined by the server itself.

• High-level updates since last IETF meeting
  • Define a NETCONF capability identifier for “resolve-system” parameter
  • Add some consideration for the client to use “resolve-system” parameter
  • State that servers MAY upgrade system configuration as well as any copied system nodes in <running> when license change or device upgrade.

• Open Issues tracked in https://github.com/netmod-wg/system-config
  • Must offline-validation of <running> alone be required? I.e., Must referenced system config always be copied into <running>? (https://github.com/netmod-wg/system-config/issues/2)
  • Should the “origin=system” be required for system configuration copied into <running>? (https://github.com/netmod-wg/system-config/issues/3)
Open Issue #1: offline-validation of <running> alone

Must offline-validation of <running> alone be required?

https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/netmod/1MwXYMoUjkYlg4LfjLHFKVqdSJ4/

Options

1. Yes, offline-validation of <running> alone must be required
2. No, offline-validation of <running> MAY consider other datastores as well
   1. Treat it as a bug-fix in existing RFCs (might break legacy clients and tool chains)
   2. Wait for a new version of YANG/NC/RC (might incur delay)
      Note: Is it a prerequisite to first standardize the config transformation between <running> and <intended>?

The current document complies with option 1 (i.e., mandate the validity of <running> alone), no changes?

OR

A possible compromise: Stating in the draft as <running> MUST always be a valid configuration data tree, and reference to RFC 8342 and RFC 7950; instead of explicitly stating referenced system configuration MUST be present in <running>.

Thoughts?
Open Issue #2: “origin” value for system nodes copied into <running>?

- The current draft doesn’t limit which origin should be used, should this be clearly defined?
- What if the copied system nodes are immutable? This is the case where configuration in <running> should not take precedence.

```
<applications xmlns="urn:example:application">
  <application>
    <name>ftp</name>
    <protocol>tcp</protocol>
    <destination-port>21</destination-port>
  </application>
  <application>
    <name>tftp</name>
    <protocol>udp</protocol>
    <destination-port>69</destination-port>
  </application>
</applications>
```

```
<applications xmlns="urn:example:application" xmlns:or="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-origin">
  <application or:origin="or:system">
    <name>ftp</name>
    <protocol>tcp</protocol>
    <destination-port>21</destination-port>
  </application>
  <application or:origin="or:system">
    <name>tftp</name>
    <protocol>udp</protocol>
    <destination-port>69</destination-port>
  </application>
</applications>
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| <applications xmlns="urn:example:application">
  <application>
    <name>ftp</name>
    <protocol>tcp</protocol>
    <destination-port>21</destination-port>
  </application>
  <application>
    <name>tftp</name>
    <protocol>udp</protocol>
    <destination-port>69</destination-port>
  </application>
</applications> | <applications xmlns="urn:example:application" xmlns:or="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-origin">
  <application or:origin="or:system">
    <name>ftp</name>
    <protocol>tcp</protocol>
    <destination-port or:origin="or:system">21</destination-port>
  </application>
  <application or:origin="or:system">
    <name>tftp</name>
    <protocol>udp</protocol>
    <destination-port or:origin="or:system">69</destination-port>
  </application>
</applications> |

The config of “applications” in <system> vs. <running>
Comments, Questions, Concerns?