An Update of Operators Requirements on Network Management Protocols and Modelling

draft-ietf-nmop-rfc3535-20years-later

Mohamed Boucadair (Orange), Luis M. Contreras (Telefónica), Óscar Gonzalez de Dios (Telefónica), Thomas Graf (Swisscom), Reshad Rahman (Equinix)

IETF 125, NMOP WG, Shenzhen, March 2026

Status

- List of ***updated operators***' requirements is ***stable***
- Operators' ***prioritization*** of that list (strong, nice-to-have) is ***stable*** as well
- These requirements need to be balanced to also take into account other views (vendors, etc.): collaborative requirements (***In progress***)
  - Build a very few set of actionable items that will be the focus of work in the IETF
  - Actionable by the IETF as a whole, including WGs, ADs, etc. Not specifically, NMOP

Overall Requirements Levels: Operators View

NEW Ops Requirement Label	Overall Level
OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM	Strong
OPS-REQ-DM-RATIONALIZE	Strong
OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL	Strong
OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-ARCH	Strong
OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE	Strong
OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM	Strong
OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM	Strong
OPS-REQ-DM2API	Strong
OPS-REQ-NW-API-DISCOVERY	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-REASSESS	Strong
OPS-REQ-BRIDGE	Strong
OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION	Strong
OPS-REQ-LOSSLESS	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY	Strong
OPS-REQ-SCALE	Strong
OPS-REQ-UNSILO	Strong
OPS-REQ-IT-INTEGRATION	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-ITER	Strong
OPS-REQ-Y2KG	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-TOOLS	Strong
OPS-REQ-IETF-TOOLS	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-NEW-NEED	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-GLUE	Nice to have

Status vs. Expected Charter Item

- List of ***updated operators***' requirements is ***stable***
- Operators' ***prioritization*** of that list (strong, nice-to-have) is ***stable*** as well

- These requirements need to be balanced to also take in
etc.): collal
  - Build a ve
be the focus of work in the IETF
  - Actionable by the IETF as a whole, including WGs, ADs, etc. Not specifically, NMOP

- Consider/plan an approach for updating RFC 3535-bis (collecting updated operator requirements for IETF network management solutions)

Discuss Item# 1

- List of ***updated operators'*** requirements is ***stable***
- Operators' ... nice-to-have) is ***stable*** as well

Should we keep this part of the document?
Are there objections to keep it in the document?

- These requirements need to be balanced to also take into account other views (vendors, etc.): collaborative requirements (***In progress***)
  - Build a very few set of actionable items that will be the focus of work in the IETF
  - Actionable by the IETF as a whole, including WGs, ADs, etc. Not specifically, NMOP

Consolidated List

1. Put ***more focus on service and network*** data models while ensuring that the ***realization*** of these abstractions can be easily correlated with underlying functionalities (*OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM, OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION*)
2. Progress ***much faster*** (*OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL, OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM*)
3. Implement ***minimal functionality***, not bells and whistles (*OPS-REQ-ITERATE*)
4. Have **running code** while a specification is under development (*OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM, OPS-REQ-TOOLS*)
5. Have vendors and operators ***on board*** at the time of developing the solution
6. Provide ***independent compliance suites*** to validate features (*OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE)*
7. Need for means to ***correlate data*** learned from different means (*OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY*)
8. Investigate approaches to ***ease adoption and integration*** into an operator's environments (*OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE, OPS-REQ-DM2API, OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION*)
9. Network-centric ***approaches have limits***, need to better integrate and learn from techniques in ***other domains*** (*OPS-REQ-BRIDGE*)

Consolidated List

ONSEN

1. Put ***more focus on service and network*** data models while ensuring that the ***realization*** of these abstractions can be easily correlated with underlying functionalities (OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM, OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION)

VELOCE

2. Progress ***much faster*** (OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL, OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM)

e.g., YP-Lite

3. Implement ***minimal functionality***, not bells and whistles (OPS-REQ-ITERATE)

Implementation policy in OPS WG Charters

4. Have **running code** while a specification is under development (OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM, OPS-REQ-TOOLS)

5. Have vendors and operators ***on board*** at the time of developing the solution

6. Provide ***independent compliance suites*** to validate features (OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE)

7. Need for means to ***correlate data*** learned from different means (OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY)

ONSEN

8. Investigate approaches to ***ease adoption and integration*** into an operator's environments (OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE, OPS-REQ-DM2API, OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION)

KG, Data Mesh, AINETOPS

9. Network-centric ***approaches have limits***, need to better integrate and learn from techniques in ***other domains*** (OPS-REQ-BRIDGE)

Open Discussion (depends #1)

- **Q#2**: Should the consolidated list be further trimmed?
- **Q#3**: Should the list be ordered?
- **Q#4**: Is there any missing important recommendations?