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Updates from WGLC

- Comments received from Juergen Schoenwaelder
  - Mail from 10/1 – number of nits – accepted
- Open topic: dealing with configurable vs. read-only topology
  - Topologies can be layered
  - Topology/nodes/links/TPs can be layered on top of supporting topology/nodes/links/TPs
  - Specifically, topologies could be configured on top of topologies that are server-provided
- Current solution
  - Server-provided object indicates source of network topology
    - `description"Indicates whether the information concerning this particular network is populated by the server (server-provided true, the general case for network information discovered from the server), or whether it is configured by a client (server-provided true, possible e.g. for service overlays managed through a controller).";`
  - Same model is used whether network topology is discovered or whether it is configured by a client application
  - Server-provided topologies are in effect configured by server-internal app; attempts to configure by non-server should in effect be rejected
module: network
  +--rw network* [network-id]
    +--rw network-id network-id
    +--ro server-provided? boolean
    +--rw network-types
    +--rw supporting-network* [network-ref]
      | +--rw network-ref leafref
    +--rw node* [node-id]
      | +--rw node-id node-id
      | +--rw supporting-node* [network-ref node-ref]
        | | +--rw network-ref leafref
        | | +--rw node-ref leafref
        | +--rw lnk:termination-point* [tp-id]
          | +--rw lnk:tp-id tp-id
          | +--rw lnk:supporting-termination-point* [network-ref node-ref tp-ref]
          | +--rw lnk:network-ref leafref
          | +--rw lnk:node-ref leafref
          | +--rw lnk:tp-ref leafref
    +--rw lnk:link* [link-id]
      +--rw lnk:link-id link-id
      +--rw lnk:source
        | +--rw lnk:source-node leafref
        | +--rw lnk:source-tp? leafref
      +--rw lnk:destination
        | +--rw lnk:dest-node leafref
        | +--rw lnk:dest-tp? leafref
      +--rw lnk:supporting-link* [network-ref link-ref]
        +--rw lnk:network-ref leafref
        +--rw lnk:link-ref leafref
Issues raised

• Separate config true and config false information
  → Move “server-provided” object into a separate tree for state

• What happens to overlay in wake of underlay changes
  – Can maintain integrity by building topologies from bottom to top, tearing down from top to bottom
  – Changing underlay can lead to referential integrity issues
  – Requires auto-updating the overlay as needed (e.g. by removing references to underlay concurrently)
  – Alternatively, might consider introducing state indicating whether layering integrity compromised (and notifications when this occurs)

• How to deal with server-provided semantics – suggested alternatives
  – Leave as is – topology data is configuration data, populated by client or server-based app
  – Split model into network state (operational) and network configuration
  – Don’t support configuration of topology
  – Add metadata annotation
Treat all topology as “regular” config

• Servers can have embedded app that populates topology
• Issues with not differentiating between apps
  – Other clients could access server-provided topology as well
    • Server provided app could “revert back”
    • Malicious clients could “lock out” server provided app
• Possible extension: add metadata
  – Tag server-provided data as such
  – Configuration and locking attempts by other clients will be rejected
  – Metadata does affect behavior of config data in this case
Split model into network state and network config

- Network state tracks network configuration where it is provided
- Issues with model split
  - Configuration data in YANG cannot refer operational data in YANG
    - Layering of configured overlays on top of server-provided networks?
  - Possible solution: replace leafrefs to references with names
    - This punts the problem to the user; model no longer ensures integrity
    - Reminiscent of MIB descriptions
    - Distinguish topology/node/link/tp-"config"-ref and topology/nod/link/tp-state-ref
  - Various integrity rules of the model can no longer be supported
    - E.g. underlay nodes/links need to be part of a supporting network
    - List keys cannot support choices of data nodes (either state or config)
  - More complex model augmentation
    - Two subtrees to augment (cannot augment groupings themselves)
  - Concern: split results in higher complexity and reduced accuracy, vs. best practices purity
- Note: model split by itself does not address problem of underlay changes (applications still required to deal with updating overlay)
Leave current solution in place

• Accept semantics of server-provided topology
  – Leverage YANG semantics provided by YANG framework to validate configuration of overlays, instead of punting this responsibility to applications
  – Simpler model structure, augmentation
  – Involves acceptance to not treat topology configuration as configuration like any other

• Possible modifications
  – Move server-provided leaf into separate state branch
  – Add documentation re: referential integrity in event of underlay changes