

IAB
Architectural Consideration for
OPES

Abbie Barbir

abbieb@nortelnetworks.com

Design Team

IAB consideration (RFC 3238)

Brief Review of Some Issue

IP-layer communications

(2.2) For an OPES framework standardized in the IETF, the OPES intermediary must be explicitly addressed at the IP layer by the end user

- **Make that mandatory (first HOP)**
 - **How about NAT/Firewall issues**
- **Do we need to consider chained**
 - **OPES intermediaries**
 - **Callout Servers**

IAB consideration (RFC 3238)

Data integrity with client-centric OPES services on responses

Notification

- (3.1) The overall OPES framework needs to assist content providers in detecting and responding to client-centric actions by OPES intermediaries that are deemed inappropriate by the content provider**

- (3.2) The overall OPES framework should assist end users in detecting the behavior of OPES intermediaries, potentially allowing them to identify imperfect or compromised intermediaries**

Tracing and Error detection

- **Our interpretation is that OPES services should, in so far as possible, make it easy to debug problems**
- **We defined explicit transformation notification as consisting of two parts:**
 1. **“via headers” to include OPES intermediaries and callout servers**
 2. **Comments or embedded naming conventions with the meaning “OPES service A transformed this element”**

- We ruled out automated semantic error detection,
 - e.g., checking images for damage by broken compression methods, malformed tags, etc.

Open Issues

- How can an origin server be made aware/trace errors caused by an OPES intermediary, and
- How can an origin server specify bypass of OPES services?
- **How can the OPES architecture not prevent users from retrieving "non-OPES" version from the content provider?**
- For example, an OPES intermediary might insert a reference to an image into an HTML page;
 - if it get the URL wrong, who will get notified about the error and how will they trace it to the faulty intermediary?
- **Basically, we need input/help**

Possible Approaches

1. HTTP Extensions

- Nasty (Yuk ...Not Again...)

2. Special OPES Headers in HTTP

- Less Nasty ????????

3. Authoring Tool

4. Separate OPES Signaling Protocol

5. Try W3C for Error Reporting

6. Give UP

The architecture document

1. It needs substantial revision to include

- content path "traceroute",
- HTTP “via header” extensions,
- error notifications,
- bypass provisions,
- confidentiality and integrity

2. We need volunteers who have time to discuss and review the architecture

Q&A