

# CoRE: CoRECONF

- RFC 9254: YANG-CBOR
- RFC-Editor (EDIT, 9 weeks): CORE-SID
- WGLC passed CORE-COMI
- WGLC passed CORE-YANG-LIBRARY
  
- (submission to CBOR WG):  
draft-bormann-cbor-yang-standin-00

# core-sid: Implementation Status

- `core-sid` -24 2023-12-22, approved 2024-01-17
  - Remaining PYANG work started at IETF 118 Hackathon
  - Message (in-flight, not at-rest) data items in YANG?
    - Little support in implementations
    - More discussion about status at IETF 119

# COMMI

Base:

RFC 9254: YANG-CBOR

draft-ietf-core-sid: Management of SID space

CoRECONF = YANG/CBOR over CoAP

RESTCONF = YANG/\* over HTTP

NETCONF = YANG/XML over SSH

# COMI: Status

- `comi` -17 2024-03-04
  - Clarification: addresses Unified Datastore only now
    - explicitly mention all-or-none semantics
    - potential discussion about future "candidates" feature
  - Fix RPC/Action examples: no redundant nesting
  - Editorial fixes
    - May need to clarify FETCH request/response pairing further

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/core/ju1SSExnniBgBcVIsa8Xok927pI>

Koen Zandberg: Recent Implementation effort went well

Can simplify CoRECONF further

- Get rid of "datastore resource" GET/PUT  
can do FETCH/iPATCH of "SID 0"
- [x] Semantics of multiple RPC/Actions in one payload?
- Get rid of term "data node resource" and § 5.2.2

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/netmod/V2R1PnDXI2TQ-jUBB5yxBIpIMbg>

## Andy Bierman (coauthor)

- [#14] (ed.) Add examples for each media type
- [x] Clarify that the spec is for a unified data store (can't use NMDA as is)
- Doubts about simplification of instance identifiers in response
- [#15] Possibly allow a filter parameter like "depth" in RESTCONF
- [x] Should provide all-or-none semantics
- [x], [#16] Editorial comments on examples
- [x] Remove extra layer of 0 in RPC/action responses
- [x] (ed.) clarify that appendices are normative

# COMI: Plan

~May 2024:

Get remaining comments addressed  
(and further examples made)

— Probably another WGLC then

# CoRE: CRIS (HREF)

- 14 (2024-01-09): address reviews mostly
  - Added section about [CoAP integration](#) (complement 7252)
  - Added EDN cri'...' notation

## To do:

- #77 more test vectors. [More test vectors.](#) (#52, #53)
- Make URL scheme registry non-negative (for CoAP uint)
- #82 Clarify determinism objective (CRI: yes, CRI reference: no)



# 8. Using CRIs with CoAP (new in -14)

## 8.1. Converting CoAP CRIs ↔ Sets of CoAP Options

- Analogue to Sections 6.4 and 6.5 of [RFC7252]

## 8.2. CoAP Options for Forward-Proxies

- Proxy-Uri → Proxy-Cri
- Proxy-Scheme → Proxy-Scheme-Number

# 8.2.1. Proxy-CRI

No.	C	U	N	R	Name	Format	Length	Default
TBD235	x	x	-		Proxy-Cri	opaque	1-1023	(none)

*Table 1: Proxy-Cri CoAP Option*

- CoAP opaque → CRI as encoded CBOR item
- Proxy-Cri overrides Proxy-Uri

# 8.2.2. Proxy-Scheme-Number

No.	C	U	N	R	Name	Format	Length	Default
TBD239	x	x	-		Proxy-Scheme-Number	uint	0-3	(none)

*Table 2: Proxy-Scheme-Number CoAP Option*

- uint → Need unsigned integer (no CBOR encoding)
- go for unsigned integer (uint) URL scheme numbers
  - use uint for CoAP directly
  - 1's complement (-1 - x) for CRI scheme-id (nint)

# HREF: Plan

Get those test vectors in place

- (edit them in CSV: PR#79)

Do the todos

Complete I-D in ~May 2024