YANG Patch Issues

draft-bierman-netconf-yang-patch-00
NETCONF WG
IETF #89 London, UK

Andy Bierman <andy@yumaworks.com>
Martin Björklund <mbj@tail-f.com>
Kent Watsen <kwatsen@juniper.net>
Rex Fernando <rex@cisco.com>

v0.3

Agenda

- Discuss and resolve open issues

YANG Patch Issues

- P1. Is PATCH well-supported?

- P2: Identification of YANG Patch capabilities

- P3: Protocol Independence

  - location leaf

  - RESTCONF Coupling

- P4: Optional Operations

- P5: global-errors needed?

- P6: Bulk Editing Support

P1. Is PATCH well-supported?

- Do enough open-source tools support PATCH?

- CoAP does not support PATCH

  – This could be an issue for a HTTP to CoAP Proxy implementation of RESTCONF

P2: Identification of YANG Patch capabilities

- How does a client know that the YANG Patch media type is supported by the server?

- Is there any functionality that could be considered optional that would need to be identified by the server capabilities?

P3: Protocol Independence

- yang-patch/target and point leafs
  (type target-resource-offset)

  - Is this syntax for a relative resource identifier acceptable for all protocols? Acceptable for just NETCONF and RESTCONF?

- yang-patch-status/location leaf
  (type inet:uri)

  - Can this be ignored in a protocol such as NETCONF?

P3a: location leaf

- Should the 'location' leaf be changed to match the 'error-node' choice in RESTCONF:

```
choice resource-identifier {
    leaf location-path {
        type instance-identifier;
    }
    leaf location-urlpath {
        type rc:data-resource-identifier;
    }
}
```

P3b: RESTCONF Coupling

- RESTCONF is a normative reference for YANG Patch

    – Imported in YANG module for rc:errors grouping

- Is this a problem for protocol independence?

P4: Optional Operations

- The 'operation' leaf has 7 operations.
    - Is there any need to allow a protocol server implementation to support a pre-defined subset?
        - create
        - delete
        - insert
        - merge
        - move
        - replace
        - remove

P5: global-errors needed?

- 2 <errors> sections in yang-patch-status

  - global-errors/errors

  - edit-status/edit/errors

- If a special 'edit-id' value was reserved, such as an empty string, it could be used in the 'edit' list to identify global errors

P6: Bulk Editing Support

- There is 1 'location' leaf ni yang-patch-status for each edit.

  - What if the protocol is using a bulk edit (such as NETCONF-EX <edit2>) and the edit list is applied to multiple nodes?

    - Should 'leaf location' be changed to 'leaf-list location'?