I2RS Status and Charter Discussion
IETF 91 - Honolulu

Edward Crabbe – edc.ietf@gmail.com

Jeffrey Haas – jhaas@pfrc.org

Document Status

- Architecture and Problem Statement need shepherd writeup and will be sent along to IESG.

- Use cases draft adopted to centralize use cases as discussed at previous session. Please provide comments.

Status

- Both chairs have been over-subscribed and haven't been proactive in moving things forward.

- Working Group itself has been generally quiet unless prodded.

- Working Group related work not necessarily happening on list but is advancing, e.g. protocol use cases, topology model.

Recharter

- We still haven't processed re-charter request (see prior slide) to officially work on data models.

- Three pillars for next charter:

  - Advance ephemeral datastore requirements, but work likely to happen outside of I2RS.

  - Work on I2RS applicable data models such as RIB model, Topology in I2RS.

  - Support work for I2RS use cases that extend/augment other protocol modules, but that work will happen in the model's parent working group.

What data models does I2RS work on?

- RIB model – how much of this has been subsumed by rtg-cfg yang module? Should we put our use cases there? Take our existing info model and build data model?

- Topology model: draft-clemm*topo, draft-dong, (and info in draft-hares) show work has been done. Adopt and move it forward?

- Other already-chartered use case – do data models?

Catch-all for some common components?

- The routing area doesn't have a complete story as to what to do with common "component" drafts such as policy.

- Does I2RS have a role in that? We already have some info models there.

Moving our work forward

- We *must* address our ephemeral state requirements; it's in the architecture.

- I2RS *may not* be the group that does the work; probably netconf.

- For disjoint data models, we can work on those actively now (although we need to submit new charter).

- For protocol use cases that require augmentation we need to address both ephemeral state issue but also "chicken and egg" question of having a protocol module to extend with I2RS cases. (Work being driven heavily by Sue Hares.)

...or shutdown?

- If we farm out ephemeral work to netconf
- ... And we farm out work to the working groups for I2RS use case extensions on their models
- ... And we finish the small number of in-chartered modules...
- Should we just conclude the working group?

Discussion?