Authors of individual drafts asked to propose a joint solution
  - Two author’s meetings held already
    - Notable discussion on telemetry/streaming use case
    - Some discussion on leveraging YANG push
  - Another scheduled for 2-weeks after IETF 95
  - Hopefully will have joint solution draft in April/May?

Will then discuss on list and, probably, hold interim
  - Objective is identifying consensus on proposed direction

Target is draft-ietf-netmod-opstate-soln-00 before Berlin
  - Following normal WG process:
    - IPR polling and Poll for adoption
Since Last Meeting

• Series of calls with draft authors: two options
  ° Some refinement on ideas, leading to refined datastores
  ° No single joint solution for intended config and applied state

• WG input solicited on list to help choose between
  ° Applied state is explicitly identified in models
    • Per draft-openconfig-netmod-opstate
  ° Applied state will be supported via revised conceptual data stores, and no explicit support is required in models
    • Per draft-schoenw-netmod-revised-datastores or draft-wilton-netmod-refined-datastores

• Result:
  ° B – revised conceptual data stores
Implications of Decision

Models need not, and SHOULD NOT, be structured to include nodes/leaves to indicate applied configuration

• Not part this decision:
  ◦ The specifics of the revised conceptual data stores
    ➢ This is the subject of the next block of discussions

• How models should be structured with respect to
  • Configuration information, e.g., interface name, and
  • Non configuration related operational information, e.g., counters

  ➢ This is covered in draft-ietf-netmod-rfc6087bis, section 5.23
    ◦ Basically says follow the same pattern as RFC7223, i.e.,
      "interfaces" and "interfaces-state" subtrees
Questions / Comments?

• (On points covered in this update please.)