ForCES Applicability Statement

draft-crouch-forces-applicability-00.txt

Mark Handley Alan Crouch

ForCES Applicability Statement

• What is an Applicability Statement?

- A short draft stating what problems it's reasonable to apply a protocol to.
- And perhaps which it isn't.

• Why does ForCES need one?

- Management of expectations.
- To ensure we're all on the same page so we can do something useful.
- To ensure that others (not here) are on the same page.
- To try to prevent people doing dumb things.

ForCES Applicability Statement

What's the process?

- First, the group agrees that it's useful in principle.
 - Hopefully today.
- Second, the group agrees with the content.
 - Hopefully today. Then we resubmit it as a WG document.
- The document continues to evolve to track the WG's consensus about how the ForCES protocol should be used.
 - But we want to be careful not to try and micromanage usage the document should remain short and high-level.
- Finally, around the time the ForCES protocol is standardized, the Applicability Statement should become an Informational RFC.

What's in the Applicability Statement?

• Not much.

What's in the Applicability Statement?

Section Headings:

- 1. Overview
- 2. Terminology
- 3. Applicability to IP Networks
 - 3.1. Applicable Services
 - 3.2. CE-FE Link Capacity
 - ▶ 3.3. CE/FE Locality
- 4. Limitations and Out-of-Scope Items
 - 4.1. Out of Scope Services
 - 4.2. Localities
- 5. Security Considerations

Applicable Services

3.1. Applicable Services

- Discovery:
 - no, ForCES assumes it's been done
- Capability Information Exchange:
 - yes, both initial and dynamic.
- Topology Information Exchange:
 - no, but may be used to convey results.
- Port Configuration:
 - yes. e.g., set attributes such as IP addresses.
- Routing Exchange:
 - yes. e.g., send routes to FEs, misses to CEs.

•

Applicable Services (cont)

QoS Exchange:

yes. FE may express capabilities. CE may configure the use of FE's capabilities.

Security Exchange:

yes. e.g., setup of IPsec tunnel from FE.

Filtering Exchange and Firewalls:

yes. e.g. FE expresses capabilities, CE configures filters in FE.

Encapsulation, Tunneling Exchange:

yes. e.g. FE expresses capabilities, CE configures tunnels in FE.

NAT and Application-level Gateways:

yes for NAT. Not a design goal for app-level gateways, but may be applicable for some.

• Measurement and Accounting:

yes, but note overlap with SNMP.

CE/FE Locality

Summary: This section states what should be blindingly obvious.

• Use ForCES in:

- Very Close Localities
- Close Localities.

Very Close Localities:

- Same box, rack, or similar.
- Basically we expect the CE-FE link to have high availability.

Close Localities:

- Only a very small number of IP hops between CE and FE.
- Those IP hops shouldn't be dynamically routed.
- Fate sharing.

CE/FE Locality: Close Localities

• Example scenario:

- FE is customer premises equipment.
- CE is at ISP facility.
- A single IP link separates CE and FE.
- FE is not uses to forward traffic between LANs at the customer premises.
- If CE-FE link fails, the FE wouldn't have anything useful it could do anyway.

Not in scope:

As above, but CE-FE link is low bandwidth relative to control/monitoring traffic.

Not in scope:

 As above, but FE also forwards traffic between LANs. If CE-FE link fails, internal forwarding at customer premises site fails.

Out of Scope Services

- Explicitly not addressed by ForCES:
 - Label Switching
 - Multimedia Gateway Control (MEGACO).

Summary

- This document basically states the obvious.
 - But what's obvious to us won't necessarily be obvious to people not involved in the ForCES group.

• What next:

- Should this be a working group document?
- Is the current content an acceptable starting point?