

NETCONF WG

*IETF 69, Chicago IL
24 July 2007
17:40-18:40*

Before we can start...

Scribe: ?
Jabber: ?

Agenda

- Administrativa (scribe, agenda bashing) - 5'
- NEE & XSDMI BOFs – 5'
- draft-ietf-netconf-notifications-08 – <=50'

NETCONF WG overview

- Network CONFiguration WG
 - <http://www.ops.ietf.org/netconf/>
- Chartered in May 2003
- Chairs:
 - Andy Bierman <ietf@andybierman.com>
 - Simon Leinen <simon.leinen@switch.ch>
- Production so far: RFC4741-4744
 - NETCONF base protocol
 - three mappings (SSH, SOAP, BEEP)

NEE BOF Outcome

- Might result in a new WG being formed, or the NETCONF WG being rechartered (and re-chaired)

XSDMI BOF

- Thursday 1300-1500
- XML schema definitions for SMIv2 data
- Access of SMIv2 MIB information through NETCONF <get>
- ...

NETCONF Notifications

- draft-ietf-netconf-notifications-08.txt
- WG item since November 2005
- Submission for publication due: Dec 2006
- Slow start, but finally getting review and discussion on the mailing list (thanks!)
- Goal this week:
 - Make it ready for ***final*** WGLC

Issue: Consistent usage of defined terms (“operation”)

- Glossary in sec. 1.1 defines operation as NETCONF operations, but in sections 5.1 and 6, the term is used with other (conventional) meanings
- Suggestions:
 - 5.1 “logical OR operation” -> “application of the logical OR operator”
 - 6 “ensure the secure operation of the following commands” -> “secure execution”
- By the way, it would be nice to include such suggestions when issues are raised.

Issue: Requirements

- Issues with the way requirements have been presented (sec. 1.4)
 - Message size (“NETCONF has no size limits?”)
 - “should not preclude” (same data model for notifications than for configuration content)
- Suggested resolution:
 - Keep them as (historical) background
 - Dan offered to merge this with 1.2 (Motivation) and reformulate for readability.

Meta-Issue: Anticipate Extensions?

- The document is formulated, in places, to encompass (“not preclude”) extensions
 - e.g. “interleaved” notification/RPC streams (1.3)
- The (extended) behavior is mentioned as a possibility without really being specified
- Suggestion: Continue to avoid situations where an extension would have to *modify* (as opposed to *extend*) spec'd behavior

Issue: session “mode change”

- While notifications are being sent, what should happen to additional <rpc> commands being received?
 - Hold them? (buffered by transport/block)
 - Drop them? (requires reading)
- Whether/how to cater for “interleaved” mode (see the “anticipating extensions” meta-issue)
- Suggestion: “A client SHOULD NOT send requests while a notification subscription is active, because the server MAY NOT process them.”
- That would leave the door open for the “interleaved” extension.

Issue: Access to stream names (`<get>` on `<eventStreams>` subtree)

- Sec 3.2.5.1 states that only streams accessible to the user should be returned.
- But section 2.1 on `<create-subscription>` doesn't mention access control at all.
- Should access control be by-stream at all, or filter the XML content of the streams (individual notifications)? Or both?

Issue: Access to stream names (`<get>` on `<eventStreams>` subtree)

- Suggestion: Deal with access control in Security Considerations
- Access control may be performed
 - At `<create-subscription>` time
 - Whenever a notification is sent over a subscription
 - When `<eventStreams>` are listed.
- The actual access control mechanisms are outside the scope of this document.

Issues: other

- Andy's issues:
<http://ops.ietf.org/lists/netconf/netconf.2007/msg00336.html>
- Some of them editorial
- Use issue tracker? (trac provided by Henrik Levkowetz from tools team)
- Editing meeting tomorrow (Wed) 1-3 PM, meet at the message board!

Other substantial issues?

(if not, we're done ;-)