Terminology Definition Discussions

Lixia Zhang

Why Need This

- We define problems
- We develop solutions
- We discuss and compare different solutions
- We need a common set of terminology for all the above
- What presented below meant to be input to discussion
  - Perhaps more questions than answers
  - Clearly articulated questions = progress!

Why We Facing Naming Problems

- We designed modularity by layers (define modularity)
- We did not enforce layering concept in identifier use (lost modularity)
  - e.g. TCP's borrowed use of IP address is problematic now
- Continued evolution of deployed system
  - the original definition/intention changed
    - E.g. NAT distorted IP address semantrics
  - New demands pop up

To Move Forward

- What must we agree on? and
- What do we not need to agree on to move vofrward?
  - So that we can let hundreds of flowers bloom now, and make informed decisions later

How many different things

That are needed in the context of routing scalability?

1. IP prefixes that are in the DFZ routing table
2. IP prefixes that are not in the DFZ
   - Example: this thing that LISP called "EID", but really not an end point identifier
3. "endpoint" identifier
   - Outside the routing system (local or global)
   - Debates going on whether calling it "Stack ID"
4. At least one addtinal identifier needs to be defined
   - Either identical to #3 or closer to application than #3

The Layer Violation of Identifier Usage

- Should/not this be fixed now? If yes, How?
  - Flexibility/convenience is desired/should be allowed
  - But how can we both allow flexibility and avoid future trouble down the road?