

Guidance for Managing YANG Modules in RFCs and IANA Registries draft-ietf-netmod-iana-yang-guidance-00|01

NETMOD WG IETF 125, Mar 2025

Presenting (on behalf of authors): Rob Wilton

**Main contributors: Jason Sterne, Reshad Rahman, Joe Clarke
+ Amanda Baber & Sabrina Tanamal (IANA)
+ Sandy Ginoza (RFC Editor Staff)**

Solution Overview

Solution Overview draft: [draft-ietf-netmod-yang-versioning-reqs-11](#)

Proposed full solution is made up of 6 drafts (at different levels of maturity):

1. Updated YANG Module Revision Handling ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-module-versioning-15](#))
2. Module semantic version number scheme ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-semver-24](#))
3. Yang module filename convention ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-module-filename-03](#))

4. **Guidance for IANA and RFC editor** ([draft-ietf-netmod-iana-yang-guidance-00](#))
5. Versioned YANG packages ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-packages-06](#))
6. YANG schema comparison tooling ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-schema-comparison-05](#))
7. Protocol operations for package version selection ([draft-ietf-netmod-yang-ver-selection-00](#))

**Potentially 4b:
IETF Packages draft**

Abstract

This document provides guidance to the RFC Editor and IANA on managing YANG modules in RFCs and IANA registries, ensuring consistent application of YANG Semantic Versioning rules.

Why

- We met with IANA at IETF 124 and they stated that they wanted more clear guidance regarding applying YANG versioning correctly.
- Also asked that this could be in a document to inform future IANA members
- Remit increased slightly to cover guidance for RFC Editor
- Goal is move quickly (hence adopted fast):
 - Aim to publish or be in the queue with other 3 versioning drafts
 - Aim: reduce some of the IANA guidance text from module versioning and semver drafts (if stars align).

How

- The -00 version was mostly generated by an LLM
 - With lots of prompting and guidance
 - Suitable because a key goal is collating guidance into one document
 - Gave a reasonable starting point
- The -01 version based on review feedback and quite a few edits:
 - Cleans up some LLM mistakes
 - Incorporates some feedback from IANA and RFC Editor
 - A few open issues worth discussing

Open Issues:





1. Do we need guidance to IANA in this document to list modules both by revision date and version? I.e., following the filename convention.
2. This document is informational, is it appropriate to use RFC 2119 language?
3. For the RFC Editor and ADs, do we want to allow the RFC Editor to apply errata to IETF YANG modules?
4. For [Section 5](#), should we give examples of the semver rules, or just reference the module versioning draft [Reshad]?

Issues 1:

Do we need guidance to IANA in this document to list modules both by revision date and version? I.e., following the filename convention.

I.e., the [IANA YANG Parameters Registry](#)

- **Proposal only use version numbers, where available, else rev date.**

Name 	File 	Maintained by IANA? 	Namespace (Modules Only) 
iana-bfd-types	iana-bfd-types@2025-11-20.yang	Y	urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:iana-bfd-types
iana-bgp-l2-encaps	iana-bgp-l2-encaps@2022-09-20.yang	Y	urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:iana-bgp-l2-encaps
iana-crypt-hash	iana-crypt-hash@2014-08-06.yang	Y	urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:iana-crypt-hash
iana-dns-class-rr-type	iana-dns-class-rr-type@2025-12-29.yang	Y	urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:iana-dns-class-rr-type

Issues 2:

This document is informational, is it appropriate to use RFC 2119 language?

Proposal:

- **Yes, fine, unless there are [strong] objections**

Issues 3:

For the RFC Editor and ADs, do we want to allow the RFC Editor to apply errata to IETF YANG modules.

Proposal:

- **Not in scope for the current document (to finish faster)**
- **Propose that this is deferred to veloce draft**
- **Need instruction from AD(s) if that want expanded scope**

Issues 4:

For [Section 5](#), should we give examples of the semver rules, or just reference the module versioning draft [Reshad]?

Proposal:

- **Mainly reference, but keep examples (to make it easier to consume)**

What's left?

- Some further updates to RFC process guidance
- Updates to tooling examples (particularly the work by Joe to suggest next version)
- And updates to address the open issues
- Further reviews by IANA, RFC Editor, WG:
 - But possibly these could all be done as part of a WG LC?

Meetings, github location

Meeting weekly on Tuesdays, 9 am US Eastern Time

Github for this draft (currently):

<https://github.com/rgwilton/iana-yang-guidance?tab=readme-ov-file>

Any Questions/Comments?