

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 7 November 2026

M. Boucadair
Orange
L. M. Contreras
O. G. D. Dios
Telefonica
T. Graf
Swisscom
R. Rahman
Equinix
6 May 2026

An Update of Operators Requirements on Network Management Protocols and
Modelling
draft-ietf-nmop-rfc3535-20years-later-04

Abstract

This document identifies a list of operators requirements for network management operations. These requirements reflect advances in this field since the publication of "IAB Network Management Workshop" (RFC 3535), which was instrumental for developing many key technologies that are widely deployed.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at
<https://github.com/boucadair/rfc3535-20years-later>.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 7 November 2026.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2026 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Observations and Operators Requirements	4
2.1. On the Importance of Data Models	4
2.2. Fragmented Ecosystem	6
2.3. The Network Becomes Consumable	6
2.4. Network APIfication	6
2.5. Lack of Profiling	7
2.6. Lack of Agile Process for (The Maintenance of) YANG Modules	7
2.7. Integration Complexity	8
2.8. YANG-formatted Data Manipulation	9
2.9. Translation and Mapping Between Service/Network and Device Models	9
2.10. (In)Consistent Data Structures in Network Protocols for Data Export	9
2.11. Proprietary YANG Modules, CLI, and Limited Abstraction	10
2.12. Distinct Networks, Distinct Management Requirements	11
2.13. Implications of External Dependency	11
2.14. Too Much Time Between Publication of New Networking Functionality and the Associated YANG	12
2.15. Lack of Implementation of Proposed Solutions	12
2.16. Tooling & Skills	13
2.16.1. Integration with "native" IT Tooling	13
2.16.2. IETF Support for Better YANG Integration	13
2.16.3. Open-source Tools	13
2.16.4. Skills	13
2.17. New Service Approaches	14
2.18. Many Solutions for the Same Problem, but Lack of Clear Applicably Guidance	14
3. Updated Operators' Requirements	14
3.1. Summary	14
3.2. Categorization	17

3.3. Overall New Requirements Levels: Operators View	18
3.4. Consolidated Requirements	20
4. Operational Considerations	20
5. Security Considerations	21
6. IANA Considerations	21
7. References	21
7.1. Normative References	21
7.2. Informative References	21
Acknowledgments	28
Contributors	28
Authors' Addresses	28

1. Introduction

The IAB organized a workshop (June 4-June 6, 2002) to establish a dialog between network operators and protocol developers, and to guide the IETF to focus on work regarding network management. The outcome of that workshop was documented in the "IAB Network Management Workshop" [RFC3535] which was instrumental for developing NETCONF [RFC6241] and YANG [RFC6020][RFC7950], in particular.

Since the publication of [RFC3535] major advances were achieved in the network managment area, such as (but not limited to):

- * SDN and Programmable Networks [RFC7149][RFC7426]
- * Automation [RFC8969]
- * Intent-based approaches [RFC9315]
- * Telemetry [RFC9232]
- * NETCONF [RFC6241]
- * RESTCONF [RFC8040]
- * CoAP Management Interface (CORECONF) [I-D.ietf-core-comi]
- * YANG [RFC7950]
- * JSON Encoding of Data Modeled with YANG [RFC7951]
- * YANG Schema Item iDentifier (YANG SID) [RFC9595]
- * YANG to CBOR mapping [RFC9254]
- * Models for management of services, networks, and devices [RFC8199][RFC8309]

- * Network APIs (e.g., [CAMARA])
- * Virtualization [RFC8568]
- * Containerization [I-D.ietf-bmwg-containerized-infra]

See also "An Overview of the IETF Network Management Standards" [RFC6632].

More than 20 years later after the publication of [RFC3535], new requirements on network management operations are emerging from the operators. This document captures these requirements that reflect the progress in this area. Readers may also refer to [I-D.iab-nemops-workshop-report].

2. Observations and Operators Requirements

2.1. On the Importance of Data Models

An appealing aspect about network automation techniques is that they almost apply to any kind of network. From that perspective, the functional component of a network automation framework that probably matters the most, and independent of the underlying interfaces and protocols, are the data models. Concretely, data models are instrumental in the automation of networks, service delivery, and infrastructures in general, especially that they can provide closed-loop control for adaptive and deterministic service creation, delivery, and maintenance.

Data models can be used to derive required configuration information for both network and service components, and state information that will be monitored and tracked. Likewise, they can be used during the service/network management life cycle (e.g., service instantiation, provisioning, optimization, monitoring, diagnostic, and assurance).

More than three decades of "Internet standardization" have shown that the specification of data models is not that straightforward. This is because of at least two major reasons:

- * For more than 30 years, legacy network equipment manufacturers have considered their technology as a competitive advantage, thereby leading to proprietary, vendor-specific, data models and the burden of vendor lock-ins. For example, there are more YANG proprietary modules than standarized ones. At the time of writing, [YC] lists 13661 unique proprietary YANG modules vs. 991 Standards modules.

- * Over the same period, operators have also developed their savoir-faire as a key competitive advantage. Such savoir-faire had to rely upon these proprietary data models (and their own ones). Operators were reluctant in the past to share their design and management practices.

The situation has changed since network "softwarization" strategies have been disclosed by vendors and operators. From a business standpoint, network "softwarization" is seen as a major transformation effort by operators, because of the flexibility and the "a la carte" approach that is promoted by "X-as-a-service" (XaaS) designs, "X" being network, platform, Network Slice [RFC9543], etc.

XaaS designs assume the availability of data models that are dynamically instantiated (along with a set of relevant policies) as a function of the "X" (and its design, for that matter). XaaS services cannot be designed, delivered, and operated without data models. Standard data models are thus key as they allow to:

- * Ease mapping among many (network/service) layers.
- * Ease data correlation from distinct sources.
- * Soften dependency on CLI specifics to vendors.
- * Support both top-down and bottom-up approaches for operating services:
- * Accurate control loops for adaptive and deterministic service creation, delivery, and maintenance.
- * Feed an intelligence that will drive appropriate actions to adjust the current status to align with the intended status.

OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM: Network softwarization can only happen with a strong, committed standardization effort, complemented by active involvement in open-source projects that facilitate access to code.

Particularly, without data models, a Network API is essentially useless (see also Section 2.4).

2.2. Fragmented Ecosystem

The current YANG device models ecosystem is fragmented: some standards data models are defined through the IETF, while similar ones are defined in other fora such as Openconfig [OC]. Unlike service and network models, IETF-defined device models are not widely implemented.

OPS-REQ-DM-RATIONALIZE: There is a need to rationalize this space and avoid redundant efforts.

2.3. The Network Becomes Consumable

Network connectivity can support tailored services in terms of Service Level Objectives (SLOs), for instance, by means of Network Slice Services [RFC9543]. This approach of "consuming the network" flexibly and dynamically is made possible by enabling means of exposing network capabilities to either internal or external applications. Then, network management is no longer limited to collect network status information, but it should be extended to permit the exposure of resources, capabilities, functionality, and associated information (e.g., inventory-based data).

OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE: Focus on protocols and data models to expose network/service capabilities, network-wide services, and related operations.

OPS-REQ-NW-API-DISCOVERY: Define a reference approach for service exposure discovery (APIs discovery).

2.4. Network APIfication

APIs are getting momentum as means of interworking between parties, also at the time of providing network services. As an example, [I-D.ietf-grow-peering-api] defines an API for dynamically establishing BGP interconnection sessions between Autonomous Systems of different administrative domains. That same objective is also covered by the YANG data model defined in [RFC9834] as exemplified in its Appendix A.10. Tools such as YANG/OpenAPI transforms are key to leverage existing data models and allow for better integration and mapping to actual realization models.

OPS-REQ-DM2API: Readily available API specifications should be generalized from YANG modules for fast development, prototyping, and validation.

2.5. Lack of Profiling

Many NETCONF-related features are (being) specified by the IETF, but these features are not widely supported (e.g., YANG-Push [RFC8639]). Some of these are not implemented because of the unbalance between actual operational need vs. complexity.

OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE: The target application/applicability of a network management approach should be documented (e.g., edit profile documents that outline a set of recommendations for core/key features, along with appropriate justifications, will help foster more implementations that meet operators' needs). This also covers security management aspects of network management. Additionally, consider independent compliance suites to validate functions/features/etc.

OPS-REQ-ARCH: Need to promote more architecture and framework documents to exemplify the intended use.

Examples of such profile documents are the various RFCs that were published by the Behavior Engineering for Hindrance Avoidance (behave) WG [BCP127]. Another approach is to consider a model similar to the "Roadmap for Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) Specification Documents" [RFC7414]. Such a document would serve as a guide and reference for implementers and others seeking information on 'NETCONF/RESTCONF/YANG'-related RFCs.

OPS-REQ-REASSESS: Additionally, reassessing the value of some IETF proposals compared to competing or emerging solutions (e.g., gRPC vs. YANG-Push) would be beneficial.

2.6. Lack of Agile Process for (The Maintenance of) YANG Modules

RFCs might not be suited for documenting YANG modules (it takes much too long, especially for updates). In the meantime, there is a need for reference data models and "sufficiently stable data models".

An hybrid approach might be investigated for documenting IETF-endorsed YANG modules, such as considering an RFC to describe the initial module sketch and objectives and an official IETF repository for maintaining intermediate YANG versions.

By drawing a parallel between YANG data models and the concept of ontology used in the field of Semantic Web, the topic of YANG module maintenance could greatly benefit from proven methodologies in knowledge engineering such as [LOT2019] and automatic documentation tools like [Widoco2017].

OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL: Develop a more agile process for the development and maintenance of YANG modules in the IETF. RFCs might not be suited for documenting YANG modules.

2.7. Integration Complexity

One of the requirements listed in Section 3 of [RFC3535] is the ease of use which, according to Section 3.2 of [RFC6244], is claimed to be addressed by NETCONF and YANG. For configuration this holds true, for network observability it is unfortunately not yet. This has been confirmed with a set of network operators asking how long it takes from subscribing YANG data to make it accessible to the operator. Minutes, Hours, Days, or Weeks. None of them answered Minutes or Hours. All of them responded Days or Weeks. Hinting manual post processing of YANG data.

Collecting YANG metrics from networks is already a struggle due to late arrival of [RFC8639], [RFC8640], [RFC8641], [I-D.ietf-netconf-https-notif], and [I-D.ietf-netconf-udp-notif] for configured subscription transport protocols which defined YANG-Push in the industry. This caused network vendors to implement alternative solutions to collect real-time streaming data in the meanwhile, such as gNMI which was proposed in 2018 in [I-D.openconfig-rtgwg-gnmi-spec] to the IETF but not followed up on. Unfortunately, these implementations differ between network Operating Systems (OSes) due to the lack of standardization, specifically for the metadata which would ensure machine readability.

When a set of network operators were asked to where operational YANG data needs to be integrated to, the answer homogeneously was Apache Kafka Message Broker and Time Series Databases. There is a need to specify how YANG-Push can be integrated into Apache Kafka and references needed YANG-Push extensions and YANG schema registry development. The YANG-Push extensions addressing needs to make YANG-Push messages machine readable and against semantic validate able to ensure a consistent data processing.

Another challenge is that the subscribed YANG data referenced with 'datastore-subtree-filter' or 'datastore-xpath-filter' breaks semantic integrity which needs to be addressed by either updating Section 4 of [RFC8641] or proposing a new YANG module being used at the YANG-Push receiver.

OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION: Consider approaches to ease integration by-design (e.g., protocols and data models).

OPS-REQ-ITERATE: Need a velocity and approach to standardization that allows for business goals to be incrementally realized.

2.8. YANG-formatted Data Manipulation

The use of a flat tree hierarchy in YANG data models may induce some performance issues compared to other graph models. This can be the case, for example, during a path calculation on a network topology. Different approaches using graph theory and compatible with YANG are currently available, but require further experimentation to generalize their adoption. For instance, OpenDaylight [ODL] implements an in-memory connected graph version of YANG-based data to enable fast breadth-first search (BFS).

OPS-REQ-Y2KG: Need for a reference specification to translate YANG-based data into the Knowledge Graph (KG).

For example, [I-D.marcas-nmop-knowledge-graph-yang] and [I-D.tailhardat-nmop-incident-management-noria] discuss YANG-2-KG proposals to leverage automated reasoning and graph traversal techniques.

OPS-REQ-SCALE: Consider approaches for YANG data models to scale.

2.9. Translation and Mapping Between Service/Network and Device Models

Navigating among multiple levels of the hierarchy (service, network, device) relies currently on proprietary solutions to graft and translate between two layers. There is no programmatic approach to ensure lossless mappings.

OPS-REQ-LOSSLESS: Consider programmatic approaches to ensure lossless mappings between service/network/device data models. Means to detect, characterize, and expose loss may be considered. Note that lossless mapping is an enabler for support of deterministic verification, auditing, and tracing back along layers/models.

2.10. (In)Consistent Data Structures in Network Protocols for Data Export

Network Telemetry, as described in [RFC9232], involve a set of protocols. Due to the different requirements, one Network Telemetry protocol doesn't address all needs. This is mainly due to the nature of the subscribed data. BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) [RFC7854] adds monitoring and tracing capabilities natively to the BGP process to minimize the processing overhead. While IPFIX [RFC7011][RFC7012] can be applied according to [RFC5472] to gain visibility into the data and forwarding planes, due to the amount of data, sampling as defined in [RFC5476] and applied to IPFIX in [RFC5477] and aggregation as defined in [RFC7015] for IPFIX is needed to reduce the amount of

exposed data. While YANG-Push focuses on exposing already YANG modelled data, which eases the correlation among network configuration and operational data.

[RFC9232] is an informational document and does not specify what these Network Telemetry protocols should have in common to ensure consistent data structures for data export. While data types are fairly good aligned, a lack of metadata standardization among the Network Telemetry protocols is observed. In particular describing from where the metrics has been exported from and timestamping. In Section 4.2 of [RFC7854] timestamps are optional and sysName [RFC1213] is only carried in the BMP initiation message (Section 4.3 of [RFC7854]), while the message header of IPFIX defined in Section 4.3 of [RFC7011] lacks the 'sysName' definition.

The lack of information from where the data is being pushed from is only known to the Network Telemetry data collection due to the transport session being established from the network node exporting the information. When Network Telemetry messages are being transformed and forwarded, this information is being lost. Therefore, it is common among network operators to augment 'sysName' and other metadata at the data collection.

The same common principle applies to when observation timestamping is missing in the Network Telemetry message. Since the data collection is the closest element to the network, a time stamp is added to give the network operator at least the information when the Network Telemetry message was collected. However, since Network Telemetry addresses real-time streaming needs, this is often not accurate enough for data correlation.

OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY: Consider approach to ensure reuse/consistent data structure.

2.11. Proprietary YANG Modules, CLI, and Limited Abstraction

Leveraging on pluggins, proprietary YANG data models or even CLI is still the rule in many operations, sometimes forced by the need of operating legacy infrastructures.

The complexity of developing and maintaining these means of operation is huge, as it is required to to cover many OSes and vendors along the lifetime of the network device.

Network models for the realization of services provide some "level" of abstraction and then allows for for more automation.

2.12. Distinct Networks, Distinct Management Requirements

From the time [RFC3535] was released up to now, new kind of services and applications have been developed and deployed over the time, with very diverse, and some times contradicting, requirements. Those services have been engineered on top of multi-service networks for the sake of efficiency and simplicity, accommodating such a variety of needs. As a result, services requiring mobility, data replication, large capacity, adaptability, multi-path support, determinism, etc., coexist on the same shared network, needing from it mechanisms for graceful operation.

Likewise, such diversity of services also require different management capabilities. For example, session continuity, distribution trees, traffic engineering, congestion status notification, reordering, or on-time delivery impose very different management needs to be satisfied.

This reality is different from the one existing at the time of [RFC3535], and as such, the new identified needs can require from novel approaches to guarantee the aforementioned co-existence of services. Some networks have specific network management requirements such as the need for asynchronous operations or constraints on data compactness. An example of such networks is Delay-Tolerant Networking (DTN) [RFC4838] or DetNet [RFC8557].

OPS-REQ-NEW-NEED: Profiling main network management technologies (e.g., recommend customized transport parameters such as timeouts and transport services) is recommended than defining network management technologies that are applicable to a single deployment context.

2.13. Implications of External Dependency

Networks are being updated to abandon the silo approach from the past towards an increasing convergence. Specifically, there are trends towards a tighter interaction and integration of different technologies previously considered as totally separated from an operational perspective. Examples of that trends are the IP and Optical integration (e.g., the introduction of colored interfaces on routers), or the extension of deterministic-behavior features to Layer 3 networks. This kind of convergence in most cases creates dependencies on the conventional network management features, which require to incorporate or integrate functionality from other technological domains.

Such convergence is also reflected on the need of interacting and interworking with distinct network parts participating in the end-to-end service delivery. Mobile access, fixed access, data center, enterprise, radio functional split (i.e., fronthaul and midhaul), neutral exchanges, intensive data networks (e.g., scientific academic networks), content distribution, etc., represent network parts constituent of end-to-end services that can impose dependencies of the management of an intermediate network.

OPS-REQ-UNSILO: The convergence observed in recent years also implies the need for an up-to-date refresh of management capabilities and tools for conventional networks.

It highlights the necessity to handle the heterogeneity of data, configuration, and network management/requirements.

From a YANG perspective, this involves easily mapping and relating the data models used to manage each specific segment.

Resolving such issue could draw on insights from parallel technical fields such as knowledge engineering practices and concepts associated with Linked Data in the Semantic Web, areas where it is common to manage problems of heterogeneity and data reconciliation across various application domains.

2.14. Too Much Time Between Publication of New Networking Functionality and the Associated YANG

For example, [RFC8667] (IS-IS extensions for SR) was published in December 2019, while [I-D.ietf-isis-sr-yang] will be published ~5 years after. There are cases where modules are not published after more than a decade of WG adoption (e.g., [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-model]).

OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM: Consider having YANG as part of the protocol specification/change where possible, or have the YANG document progress in parallel. That may slow down the protocol specification, though.

2.15. Lack of Implementation of Proposed Solutions

New solutions proposed by WGs such as NETMOD and NETCONF very often lack an implementation or only have a partial implementation. The situation has improved with the last hackathons (e.g., for YANG-Push), but these solutions became RFCs without a known implementation:

- * YANG-Push [RFC8641]

- * Schema-mount [RFC8528]

- * NMDA [RFC8342]

Schema-mount allegedly has only one known implementation because of the complexity of the solution. That means the IETF most likely spent lots of cycles for something which won't be deployed ever.

While hackathons have improved the situation, the availability of implementations is concerning. For open-source, 'sysrepo'/'libyang' are decent choices.

OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM: The availability of implementations is concerning. Consider catalyst approaches to trigger more (open) implementations, especially during the development of protocols/extensions.

2.16. Tooling & Skills

2.16.1. Integration with "native" IT Tooling

OPS-REQ-IT-INTEGRATION: There is a need to ease the integration of low-level/network-oriented solution with native "IT tooling" (e.g., "https://opentelemetry.io/").

2.16.2. IETF Support for Better YANG Integration

OPS-REQ-IETF-TOOLS Ease exposure of libraries and host tools (e.g., yangkit) to ease integration.

2.16.3. Open-source Tools

While there are open-source implementations for NETCONF (e.g., NETOPEER), the gRPC/gNMI suite seems to have more support for tools on the client side. For example, "ygot" generates structures from YANG models and these can easily be used by a client to configure a device with gNMI. NETCONF is not supported though (the XML tags are needed).

OPS-REQ-CLIENT-TOOLS: Focus on tooling is needed, especially on the client side.

2.16.4. Skills

The IETF is not the expert community in data engineering. The experts are in the data industry. Without them, integration in data processing chains like Data Mesh is going to be a challenge.

OPS-REQ-BRIDGE: Create an eco-system where data and networking engineers can collaborate.

2.17. New Service Approaches

The virtualization trend have made possible to dynamically instantiate Service Functions (SFs) in distributed compute facilities in the form of virtual machines or containers, as micro-services. The instantiation of the SFs is governed by cloud management systems, as it is the connectivity among the different instances or micro-services. That connectivity is typically realized by using overlay mechanisms, without any further interaction with the network. However, this approach seems to be insufficient for future services demanding stringent requirements in terms of SLOs.

OPS-REQ-GLUE: The distinct approaches followed in both the compute and the network environments makes necessary to define suitable mechanisms for enabling an efficient interplay, while highly automating the overall service delivery procedure.

2.18. Many Solutions for the Same Problem, but Lack of Clear Applicably Guidance

There are several solutions that were standardized for network management purposes. For example, management of ACLs by means to BGP FlowSpec [RFC8955][RFC8956] or by means of NETCONF/YANG [RFC8519]. There is no cross referencing between the two standards or delimits its applicability scope vs the other approach.

Likewise, BGP FlowSpec did not reuse the IPFIX Information Elements.

OPS-REQ-GUIDANCE: The target application/applicability of a network management approach should be integrated in the specification itself.

3. Updated Operators' Requirements

3.1. Summary

A summary of the operators' requirements discussed in the previous section is provided below:

OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM: Network softwarization can only happen with a strong, committed standardization effort, complemented by active involvement in open-source projects that facilitate access to code.

OPS-REQ-DM-RATIONALIZE: Rationalize this space and avoid redundant

efforts (in almost all layers (IP, optic, etc.)). Unlike service and network models, Standard-based device models are not widely implemented.

OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE: Focus on protocols and data models to expose network/service capabilities, network-wide services, and related operations.

OPS-REQ-NW-API-DISCOVERY: Define a reference approach/process for service exposure discovery (APIs discovery).

OPS-REQ-DM2API: Readily available API specifications should be generalized from YANG modules for fast development, prototyping, and validation.

OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE: The target application/applicability of a network management approach should be documented (e.g., edit profile documents that outline a set of recommendations for core/key features, along with appropriate justifications, will help foster more implementations that meet operators' needs). This also covers security management aspects of network management. Additionally, consider independent compliance suites to validate functions/features/etc.

OPS-REQ-ARCH: Need to promote more architecture and framework documents to exemplify the intended use.

OPS-REQ-REASSESS: Reassess the value of some IETF proposals, including compared to competing or emerging solutions (e.g., gNMI).

OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL: Develop a more agile process for the development and maintenance of YANG modules in the IETF. RFCs might not be suited for documenting YANG modules.

OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION: Consider approaches to ease integration by-design (e.g., protocols and data models). The integration covers both horizontal and vertical realms. For example, there is a lack of enablement of this integration across standard bodies that operators are left to solve.

OPS-REQ-ITERATE: Need a velocity and approach to standardization that allows for business goals to be incrementally realized.

OPS-REQ-Y2KG: Need for reference specifications to translate YANG-based data into the Knowledge Graph. Sample use cases to illustrate the intended use should be considered as well.

OPS-REQ-SCALE: Consider approaches for YANG data models to scale, including protocol considerations (transactions, etc.). Specifically, address telemetry scalability enhancements.

OPS-REQ-LOSSLESS: Consider programmatic approaches to ensure lossless mappings between service/network/device data models. Means to detect, characterize, and expose loss may be considered. Note that lossless mapping is an enabler for support of deterministic verification, auditing, and tracing back along layers/models.

OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY: Consider approaches to ensure reuse/consistent data structure across various network management segments. This will ease correlating data learned using different means (IPFIX [RFC7011], BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) [RFC7854], SYSLOG [RFC5424], etc.).

OPS-REQ-NEW-NEED: Profiling main network management technologies (e.g., recommend customized transport parameters such as timeouts and transport services) is recommended than defining network management technologies that are applicable to a single deployment context.

OPS-REQ-UNSILO: Necessity to handle the heterogeneity of data, configuration, and network management/requirements. Resolving such issue could draw on insights from parallel technical fields such as knowledge engineering practices and concepts associated with Linked Data in the Semantic Web, areas where it is common to manage problems of heterogeneity and data reconciliation across various application domains.

OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM: Consider having YANG as part of the protocol specification/change where possible, or have the YANG document progress in parallel.

OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM: The availability of implementation is concerning. Consider catalyst approaches to trigger more (open) implementations, especially during the development of protocols/extensions.

OPS-REQ-IT-INTEGRATION: There is a need to ease the integration of low-level/network-oriented solution with native "IT tooling" (e.g., <https://opentelemetry.io/>).

OPS-REQ-IETF-TOOLS: Ease exposure of libraries and host tools (e.g., yangkit) to ease integration.

OPS-REQ-CLIENT-TOOLS: Focus on tooling is needed, especially on the

client side. There is a need for tools that are easy to use. Likewise, there is need for support for multiple friendly, stable, and feature-rich libraries for programming languages.

OPS-REQ-BRIDGE: Create an eco-system where data and networking engineers can collaborate.

OPS-REQ-GLUE: Distinct approaches followed in both the compute and the network environments make necessary to define suitable mechanisms for enabling an efficient interplay, while highly automating the overall service delivery procedure.

OPS-REQ-GUIDANCE: The target application/applicability of a network management approach should be integrated in the specification itself.

3.2. Categorization

Table 1 provides a classification of the requirements listed in Section 3.1. It specifically tag whether a requirement:

- * Belongs to data modeling (DM)
- * Requires protocol work (Proto)
- * Impacts deployability of standardized approaches (Deploy)
- * Has implications on integration effort by operators (Int)
- * Requires some adaptations to a Standards Developing Organization (SDO) process (Process)
- * Allows better coordination (Collaboration & Cooperation (C&C))
- * Is relevant to skill transformations (Skills)

Ops Requirement Label	DM	Proto	Deploy	Int	Process	C&C	Skills
OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM	X		X				
OPS-REQ-DM-RATIONALIZE	X		X		X	X	
OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE	X	X	X	X			
OPS-REQ-NW-API-DISCOVERY			X	X			
OPS-REQ-DM2API			X				

OPS-REQ-GUIDE-PROFILE	X	X	X					
OPS-REQ-ARCH		X	X					
OPS-REQ-REASSESS		X						
OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL	X	X	X					
OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION			X	X	X			
OPS-REQ-ITERATE					X	X		
OPS-REQ-Y2KG			X	X				
OPS-REQ-SCALE	X	X						
OPS-REQ-LOSSLESS			X	X	X			
OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY		X		X	X			
OPS-REQ-NEW-NEED		X						
OPS-REQ-UNSILO			X	X				
OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM	X		X					
OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM	X	X	X		X			
OPS-REQ-IT-INTEGRATION			X	X				
OPS-REQ-IETF-TOOLS					X			X
OPS-REQ-CLIENT-TOOLS			X	X				X
OPS-REQ-BRIDGE						X	X	
OPS-REQ-GLUE				X				X
OPS-REQ-GUIDANCE			X					

Table 1: Requirements Classification

3.3. Overall New Requirements Levels: Operators View

Table 2 provides the requirement level of Section 3.1 from an operator perspective.

Ops Requirement Label	Overall Operators Level
OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM	Strong
OPS-REQ-DM-RATIONALIZE	Strong
OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE	Strong
OPS-REQ-NW-API-DISCOVERY	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-DM2API	Strong
OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-ARCH	Strong
OPS-REQ-REASSESS	Strong
OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL	Strong
OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION	Strong
OPS-REQ-ITERATE	Strong
OPS-REQ-Y2KG	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-SCALE	Strong
OPS-REQ-LOSSLESS	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY	Strong
OPS-REQ-NEW-NEED	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-UNSILO	Strong
OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM	Strong
OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM	Strong
OPS-REQ-IT-INTEGRATION	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-IETF-TOOLS	Nice to have
OPS-REQ-CLIENT-TOOLS	Strong
OPS-REQ-BRIDGE	Strong

+	-----+	+	-----+
	OPS-REQ-GLUE		Nice to have
+	-----+	+	-----+
	OPS-REQ-GUIDANCE		Nice to have
+	-----+	+	-----+

Table 2: Operators Requirements Levels

3.4. Consolidated Requirements

This section provides a consolidated view of main requirements that takes into account inputs from actors beyond operators:

- * Put more focus on service and network data models (OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE, OPS-REQ-STRENGTHEN-DM) while ensuring that the realization of these abstractions can be easily correlated with underlying functionalities (OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION).
- * Progress much faster (OPS-REQ-QUICK-BUT-WELL, OPS-REQ-TIMELY-DM).
- * Implement minimal functionality, not bells and whistles (OPS-REQ-ITERATE).
- * Have running code while a specification is under development (OPS-REQ-READILY-IMPLEM, OPS-REQ-TOOLS).
- * Have vendors and operators on board at the time of developing a network management solution.
- * Provide independent compliance suites to validate features (OPS-REQ-GUIDE-AND-PROFILE).
- * Need for means to correlate data learned from different means (OPS-REQ-REUSABILITY).
- * Investigate approaches to ease adoption and integration into an operator' s environments (OPS-REQ-EASE-EXPOSURE, OPS-REQ-DM2API, OPS-REQ-INTEGRATION).
- * Network-centric approaches have limits, need to better integrate and learn from techniques in other domains (OPS-REQ-BRIDGE).

4. Operational Considerations

This document exclusively focuses on operations and management requirements. These considerations (deployability, integration, complexity, etc.) are not repeated here.

5. Security Considerations

This document does not define any protocol or architecture.

6. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC3535] Schoenwaelder, J., "Overview of the 2002 IAB Network Management Workshop", RFC 3535, DOI 10.17487/RFC3535, May 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3535>>.

7.2. Informative References

- [BCP127] Best Current Practice 127,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp127>>.
At the time of writing, this BCP comprises the following:

Audet, F., Ed. and C. Jennings, "Network Address Translation (NAT) Behavioral Requirements for Unicast UDP", BCP 127, RFC 4787, DOI 10.17487/RFC4787, January 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4787>>.

Perreault, S., Ed., Yamagata, I., Miyakawa, S., Nakagawa, A., and H. Ashida, "Common Requirements for Carrier-Grade NATs (CGNs)", BCP 127, RFC 6888, DOI 10.17487/RFC6888, April 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6888>>.

Penno, R., Perreault, S., Boucadair, M., Ed., Sivakumar, S., and K. Naito, "Updates to Network Address Translation (NAT) Behavioral Requirements", BCP 127, RFC 7857, DOI 10.17487/RFC7857, April 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7857>>.

- [CAMARA] "CAMARA", <<https://camaraproject.org/>>.

[I-D.iab-nemops-workshop-report]

Hardaker, W. and D. Dhody, "Report from the IAB Workshop on the Next Era of Network Management Operations (NEMOPS)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-iab-nemops-workshop-report-04, 29 August 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-iab-nemops-workshop-report-04>>.

[I-D.ietf-bmwg-containerized-infra]

Ngc, T. M., Ko, 7. 9. 1. 1. 1. 1. 3. 7., Rao, S., Lee, J., and Y. Kim, "Considerations for Benchmarking Network Performance in Containerized Infrastructures", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-bmwg-containerized-infra-09, 12 April 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-bmwg-containerized-infra-09>>.

[I-D.ietf-core-comi]

Veillette, M., Van der Stok, P., Pelov, A., Bierman, A., and C. Bormann, "CoAP Management Interface (CORECONF)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-core-comi-21, 2 March 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-core-comi-21>>.

[I-D.ietf-grow-peering-api]

Aguado, C., Griswold, M., Ramseyer, J., Servin, A., Strickx, T., and Q. Misell, "Peering API", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-grow-peering-api-01, 4 July 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-grow-peering-api-01>>.

[I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-model]

Jethanandani, M., Patel, K., Hares, S., and J. Haas, "YANG Model for Border Gateway Protocol (BGP-4)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-idr-bgp-model-19, 2 March 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-idr-bgp-model-19>>.

[I-D.ietf-isis-sr-yang]

Litkowski, S., Qu, Y., Lindem, A., Chen, H., and J. Tantsura, "A YANG Data Model for IS-IS Segment Routing over the MPLS Data Plane", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-isis-sr-yang-31, 6 May 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-isis-sr-yang-31>>.

[I-D.ietf-netconf-https-notif]

Jethanandani, M. and K. Watsen, "An HTTPS-based Transport for YANG Notifications", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-netconf-https-notif-15, 1 February 2024, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-netconf-https-notif-15>>.

[I-D.ietf-netconf-udp-notif]

Feng, A. H., Francois, P., Zhou, T., Graf, T., and P. Lucente, "UDP-based Transport for Configured

Subscriptions", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-netconf-udp-notif-25, 28 January 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-netconf-udp-notif-25>>.

[I-D.marcas-nmop-knowledge-graph-yang]

Martinez-Casanueva, I. D., Cabanillas, L., and P. Martinez-Julia, "Knowledge Graphs for YANG-based Network Management", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-marcas-nmop-knowledge-graph-yang-05, 21 October 2024, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-marcas-nmop-knowledge-graph-yang-05>>.

[I-D.openconfig-rtgwg-gnmi-spec]

Shakir, R., Shaikh, A., Borman, P., Hines, M., Lebsack, C., and C. Morrow, "gRPC Network Management Interface (gNMI)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-openconfig-rtgwg-gnmi-spec-01, 5 March 2018, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-openconfig-rtgwg-gnmi-spec-01>>.

[I-D.tailhardat-nmop-incident-management-noria]

Tailhardat, L., Troncy, R., Chabot, Y., Ramparany, F., Folz, P., and B. Kavanagh, "Knowledge Graphs for Enhanced Cross-Operator Incident Management and Network Design", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-tailhardat-nmop-incident-management-noria-04, 9 February 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-tailhardat-nmop-incident-management-noria-04>>.

[LOT2019] Poveda-Villalon, M., Fernandez-Izquierdo, A., Fernandez-Lopez, M., and R. Garcia-Castro, "LOT: An industrial oriented ontology engineering framework", 2022, <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.104755>>.

[OC] "Openconfig", <<https://www.openconfig.net/>>.

[ODL] "Graph Model Overview", 2023, <<https://docs.opendaylight.org/projects/bgpcep/en/latest/graph/graph-user-guide-graph-model.html#>>.

[RFC1213] McCloghrie, K. and M. Rose, "Management Information Base for Network Management of TCP/IP-based internets: MIB-II", STD 17, RFC 1213, DOI 10.17487/RFC1213, March 1991, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1213>>.

- [RFC4838] Cerf, V., Burleigh, S., Hooke, A., Torgerson, L., Durst, R., Scott, K., Fall, K., and H. Weiss, "Delay-Tolerant Networking Architecture", RFC 4838, DOI 10.17487/RFC4838, April 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4838>>.
- [RFC5424] Gerhards, R., "The Syslog Protocol", RFC 5424, DOI 10.17487/RFC5424, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5424>>.
- [RFC5472] Zseby, T., Boschi, E., Brownlee, N., and B. Claise, "IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Applicability", RFC 5472, DOI 10.17487/RFC5472, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5472>>.
- [RFC5476] Claise, B., Ed., Johnson, A., and J. Quittek, "Packet Sampling (PSAMP) Protocol Specifications", RFC 5476, DOI 10.17487/RFC5476, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5476>>.
- [RFC5477] Dietz, T., Claise, B., Aitken, P., Dressler, F., and G. Carle, "Information Model for Packet Sampling Exports", RFC 5477, DOI 10.17487/RFC5477, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5477>>.
- [RFC6020] Bjorklund, M., Ed., "YANG - A Data Modeling Language for the Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6020, DOI 10.17487/RFC6020, October 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6020>>.
- [RFC6241] Enns, R., Ed., Bjorklund, M., Ed., Schoenwaelder, J., Ed., and A. Bierman, Ed., "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6241, DOI 10.17487/RFC6241, June 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6241>>.
- [RFC6244] Shafer, P., "An Architecture for Network Management Using NETCONF and YANG", RFC 6244, DOI 10.17487/RFC6244, June 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6244>>.
- [RFC6632] Ersue, M., Ed. and B. Claise, "An Overview of the IETF Network Management Standards", RFC 6632, DOI 10.17487/RFC6632, June 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6632>>.
- [RFC7011] Claise, B., Ed., Trammell, B., Ed., and P. Aitken, "Specification of the IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Protocol for the Exchange of Flow Information", STD 77, RFC 7011, DOI 10.17487/RFC7011, September 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7011>>.

- [RFC7012] Claise, B., Ed. and B. Trammell, Ed., "Information Model for IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX)", RFC 7012, DOI 10.17487/RFC7012, September 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7012>>.
- [RFC7015] Trammell, B., Wagner, A., and B. Claise, "Flow Aggregation for the IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Protocol", RFC 7015, DOI 10.17487/RFC7015, September 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7015>>.
- [RFC7149] Boucadair, M. and C. Jacquenet, "Software-Defined Networking: A Perspective from within a Service Provider Environment", RFC 7149, DOI 10.17487/RFC7149, March 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7149>>.
- [RFC7414] Duke, M., Braden, R., Eddy, W., Blanton, E., and A. Zimmermann, "A Roadmap for Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) Specification Documents", RFC 7414, DOI 10.17487/RFC7414, February 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7414>>.
- [RFC7426] Haleplidis, E., Ed., Pentikousis, K., Ed., Denazis, S., Hadi Salim, J., Meyer, D., and O. Koufopavlou, "Software-Defined Networking (SDN): Layers and Architecture Terminology", RFC 7426, DOI 10.17487/RFC7426, January 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7426>>.
- [RFC7854] Scudder, J., Ed., Fernando, R., and S. Stuart, "BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)", RFC 7854, DOI 10.17487/RFC7854, June 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7854>>.
- [RFC7950] Bjorklund, M., Ed., "The YANG 1.1 Data Modeling Language", RFC 7950, DOI 10.17487/RFC7950, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7950>>.
- [RFC7951] Lhotka, L., "JSON Encoding of Data Modeled with YANG", RFC 7951, DOI 10.17487/RFC7951, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7951>>.
- [RFC8040] Bierman, A., Bjorklund, M., and K. Watsen, "RESTCONF Protocol", RFC 8040, DOI 10.17487/RFC8040, January 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8040>>.
- [RFC8199] Bogdanovic, D., Claise, B., and C. Moberg, "YANG Module Classification", RFC 8199, DOI 10.17487/RFC8199, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8199>>.

- [RFC8309] Wu, Q., Liu, W., and A. Farrel, "Service Models Explained", RFC 8309, DOI 10.17487/RFC8309, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8309>>.
- [RFC8342] Bjorklund, M., Schoenwaelder, J., Shafer, P., Watsen, K., and R. Wilton, "Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA)", RFC 8342, DOI 10.17487/RFC8342, March 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8342>>.
- [RFC8519] Jethanandani, M., Agarwal, S., Huang, L., and D. Blair, "YANG Data Model for Network Access Control Lists (ACLs)", RFC 8519, DOI 10.17487/RFC8519, March 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8519>>.
- [RFC8528] Bjorklund, M. and L. Lhotka, "YANG Schema Mount", RFC 8528, DOI 10.17487/RFC8528, March 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8528>>.
- [RFC8557] Finn, N. and P. Thubert, "Deterministic Networking Problem Statement", RFC 8557, DOI 10.17487/RFC8557, May 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8557>>.
- [RFC8568] Bernardos, C.J., Rahman, A., Zuniga, J.C., Contreras, L.M., Aranda, P., and P. Lynch, "Network Virtualization Research Challenges", RFC 8568, DOI 10.17487/RFC8568, April 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8568>>.
- [RFC8639] Voit, E., Clemm, A., Gonzalez Prieto, A., Nilsen-Nygaard, E., and A. Tripathy, "Subscription to YANG Notifications", RFC 8639, DOI 10.17487/RFC8639, September 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8639>>.
- [RFC8640] Voit, E., Clemm, A., Gonzalez Prieto, A., Nilsen-Nygaard, E., and A. Tripathy, "Dynamic Subscription to YANG Events and Datastores over NETCONF", RFC 8640, DOI 10.17487/RFC8640, September 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8640>>.
- [RFC8641] Clemm, A. and E. Voit, "Subscription to YANG Notifications for Datastore Updates", RFC 8641, DOI 10.17487/RFC8641, September 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8641>>.
- [RFC8667] Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Ed., Filsfils, C., Bashandy, A., Gredler, H., and B. Decraene, "IS-IS Extensions for Segment Routing", RFC 8667, DOI 10.17487/RFC8667, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8667>>.

- [RFC8955] Loibl, C., Hares, S., Raszuk, R., McPherson, D., and M. Bacher, "Dissemination of Flow Specification Rules", RFC 8955, DOI 10.17487/RFC8955, December 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8955>>.
- [RFC8956] Loibl, C., Ed., Raszuk, R., Ed., and S. Hares, Ed., "Dissemination of Flow Specification Rules for IPv6", RFC 8956, DOI 10.17487/RFC8956, December 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8956>>.
- [RFC8969] Wu, Q., Ed., Boucadair, M., Ed., Lopez, D., Xie, C., and L. Geng, "A Framework for Automating Service and Network Management with YANG", RFC 8969, DOI 10.17487/RFC8969, January 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8969>>.
- [RFC9232] Song, H., Qin, F., Martinez-Julia, P., Ciavaglia, L., and A. Wang, "Network Telemetry Framework", RFC 9232, DOI 10.17487/RFC9232, May 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9232>>.
- [RFC9254] Veillette, M., Ed., Petrov, I., Ed., Pelov, A., Bormann, C., and M. Richardson, "Encoding of Data Modeled with YANG in the Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR)", RFC 9254, DOI 10.17487/RFC9254, July 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9254>>.
- [RFC9315] Clemm, A., Ciavaglia, L., Granville, L. Z., and J. Tantsura, "Intent-Based Networking - Concepts and Definitions", RFC 9315, DOI 10.17487/RFC9315, October 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9315>>.
- [RFC9543] Farrel, A., Ed., Drake, J., Ed., Rokui, R., Homma, S., Makhijani, K., Contreras, L., and J. Tantsura, "A Framework for Network Slices in Networks Built from IETF Technologies", RFC 9543, DOI 10.17487/RFC9543, March 2024, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9543>>.
- [RFC9595] Veillette, M., Ed., Pelov, A., Ed., Petrov, I., Ed., Bormann, C., and M. Richardson, "YANG Schema Item Identifier (YANG SID)", RFC 9595, DOI 10.17487/RFC9595, July 2024, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9595>>.
- [RFC9834] Boucadair, M., Ed., Roberts, R., Ed., Gonzalez de Dios, O., Barguil, S., and B. Wu, "YANG Data Models for Bearers and Attachment Circuits as a Service (ACaaS)", RFC 9834, DOI 10.17487/RFC9834, September 2025, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9834>>.

[Widoco2017]

Garijo, D., "WIDOCO: a wizard for documenting ontologies", 2017, <<http://dgarijo.com/papers/widoco-iswc2017.pdf>>.

[YC]

"YANG Catalog, YANG Modules Stats", 2026, <<https://www.yangcatalog.org/private-page>>.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Christian Jacquenet and Jean-Michel Combes for their inputs.

Thanks to Benot Claise and Alex Clemm for the comments.

Many of the requirements were extracted from contributions to the IAB Next Era of Network Management Operations (NEMOPS) Workshop [I-D.iab-nemops-workshop-report].

Thanks to Ian Farrer, Brad Peters, Chongfeng Xie, and Qin Wu for their contribution to consolidate the requirements.

Contributors

Lionel Tailhardat
Orange
Email: lionel.tailhardat@orange.com

Authors' Addresses

Mohamed Boucadair
Orange
Email: mohamed.boucadair@orange.com

Luis M. Contreras
Telefonica
Email: luismiguel.contrerasmurillo@telefonica.com

Oscar Gonzalez de Dios
Telefonica
Email: oscar.gonzalezdedios@telefonica.com

Thomas Graf
Swisscom
Email: thomas.graf@swisscom.com

Reshad Rahman
Equinix
Email: rrahman@equinix.com