IPFIX Testing Draft
draft-ietf-ipfix-testing-01

Paul Aitken (paitken@cisco.com)
Carsten Schmoll (schmoll@fokus.fraunhofer.de)
Benoit Claise (bclaise@cisco.com)

69th IETF - Chicago, IL, USA
IPFIX Working Group

Overview

- Compare version -00 and current version, -01

- Give the current status

- Overview of feedback received during last call

Comparing -00 and -01 #1

- Added complete terminology section, and corrected terminology throughout.

- Added Template Withdrawal Message.

- Added TLS connectivity section.

Comparing -00 and -01 #2

- Added figures to illustrate incorrect Templates.

- Added references section.

- Tests now phrased in RFC2119 language: MUST and SHOULD.

Current status

- Draft was in last call until July 14th.

- Propose to leave the last call running to the end of IETF week (July 27th) to provide the opportunity for further feedback.

- Some corrections and updates are needed, resulting from last call feedback.

- The next revision of the draft will be ready for submission to IESG.

Last call feedback #1.1

- Does padding with non-zero valued octets constitute a malformed message?

- IPFIX-PROTO says:

  "For security reasons, the padding
   octet(s) MUST be composed of zero (0)
   valued octets."

  "If the Collecting Process receives a
   malformed IPFIX Message, it MUST reset
   the SCTP association, discard the IPFIX
   Message, and SHOULD log the error."

Last call feedback #1.2

- **Proposal**: The Collecting Process MUST verify the message format, including padding between sets, and reset the connection if the message format is incorrect or non-zero valued padding is used.

- The Collecting Process should not verify the message contents (ie, the values of the Information Elements) - including paddingOctets Information Element.

Last call feedback #2

- Scope field count of zero:

- IPFIX-PROTO says:

  "`Finally, note that the Scope Field Count MAY NOT be zero.`"

- "MAY NOT" is not defined in RFC 2119.

- Could be interpreted as probability rather than permission.

- **Proposal**: correct IPFIX-PROTO to "MUST NOT", and include a check in IPFIX-TESTING.

Last call feedback #3.1

- IPFIX-PROTO doesn't specify very clearly what to do for TCP transport if a Template ID is reused inside the template expiry time.

- (ie, same Template ID, different template definition).

Last call feedback #3.2

- **Proposal**: modify section 9 of IPFIX-PROTO:

  - "Template IDs are unique per **SCTP association** and per Observation Domain. If the Collecting Process receives a Template which has already been received but which has not previously been withdrawn (i.e. a Template Record from the same Exporter Observation Domain with the same Template ID received on the **SCTP association**), then the Collecting Process MUST shutdown the association."

  - "When an **SCTP association** is closed, the Collecting Process MUST discard all Templates received over that association and stop decoding IPFIX Messages that use those Templates."

- Change **"SCTP association"** to **"SCTP association or TCP connection"**.

Last call feedback #4

- Sending an IPFIX "All Data Templates Withdrawal Message" when no Templates have yet been defined?

- Or sending the ADTWM twice without defining any Templates in between?

- Same for Options Template Withdrawal too.

- **Proposal**: this is not invalid.

IPFIX Testing Draft
draft-ietf-ipfix-testing-01

Paul Aitken (paitken@cisco.com)
Carsten Schmoll (schmoll@fokus.fraunhofer.de)
Benoit Claise (bclaise@cisco.com)

69th IETF - Chicago, IL, USA
IPFIX Working Group