

alto
Internet-Draft
Updates: [7285](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 4 December 2022

M. Boucadair
Orange
Q. Wu
Huawei
2 June 2022

A Cost Mode Registry for the Application-Layer Traffic Optimization
(ALTO) Protocol
draft-ietf-alto-cost-mode-05

Abstract

This document creates a new IANA registry for tracking cost modes supported by the Application-Layer Traffic Optimization (ALTO) Protocol. Also, this document relaxes a constraint that was imposed by the ALTO specification on allowed cost mode values.

This document updates [RFC 7285](#).

Editorial Note (To be removed by RFC Editor)

Please update RFC XXXX statements within the document with the RFC number to be assigned to this document.

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 4 December 2022.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 [2](#)
- [2.](#) Terminology [3](#)
- [3.](#) Updates to [RFC7285](#) [3](#)
 - [3.1.](#) Updates to [Section 6.1.2 of RFC7285](#) [3](#)
 - [3.2.](#) Updates to [Section 10.5 of RFC7285](#) [4](#)
- [4.](#) Backward Compatibility Considerations [5](#)
- [5.](#) IANA Considerations [5](#)
- [6.](#) Security Considerations [6](#)
- [7.](#) Acknowledgements [6](#)
- [8.](#) References [6](#)
 - [8.1.](#) Normative References [6](#)
 - [8.2.](#) Informative References [7](#)
- Authors' Addresses [7](#)

[1.](#) Introduction

The cost mode attribute indicates how costs should be interpreted when communicated in the Application-Layer Traffic Optimization (ALTO) Protocol [[RFC7285](#)]. The base ALTO specification includes a provision for only two modes:

"numerical": Indicates that numerical operations can be performed (e.g., normalization) on the returned costs ([Section 6.1.2.1 of \[RFC7285\]](#)).

"ordinal": Indicates that the cost values in a cost map represent ranking (relative to all other values in a cost map), not actual costs ([Section 6.1.2.2 of \[RFC7285\]](#)).

Additional cost modes are required for specific ALTO deployment cases (e.g., [[I-D.ietf-alto-path-vector](#)]). In order to allow for such use cases, this document relaxes the constraint imposed by the base ALTO

specification on allowed cost modes ([Section 3](#)) and creates a new ALTO registry to track new cost modes ([Section 5](#)).

The mechanisms defined in [[RFC7285](#)] are used to advertise the support of new cost modes for specific cost metrics. Refer to [Section 4](#) for more details.

[2.](#) Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)][[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

This document makes use of the terms defined in [[RFC7285](#)].

[3.](#) Updates to [RFC7285](#)

[3.1.](#) Updates to [Section 6.1.2 of RFC7285](#)

This document updates [Section 6.1.2 of \[RFC7285\]](#) as follows:

OLD:

The cost mode attribute indicates how costs should be interpreted. Specifically, the cost mode attribute indicates whether returned costs should be interpreted as numerical values or ordinal rankings.

It is important to communicate such information to ALTO clients, as certain operations may not be valid on certain costs returned by an ALTO server. For example, it is possible for an ALTO server to return a set of IP addresses with costs indicating a ranking of the IP addresses. Arithmetic operations that would make sense for numerical values, do not make sense for ordinal rankings. ALTO clients may handle such costs differently.

Cost modes are indicated in protocol messages as strings.

NEW:

The cost mode attribute indicates how costs should be interpreted. Two cost modes (numerical values and ordinal rankings) are defined, but additional cost modes can be defined in the future.

It is important to communicate such information to ALTO clients, as certain operations may not be valid on certain costs returned by an ALTO server. For example, it is possible for an ALTO server to return a set of IP addresses with costs indicating a ranking of

the IP addresses. Arithmetic operations that would make sense for numerical values, do not make sense for ordinal rankings. ALTO clients may handle such costs differently.

Cost modes are indicated in protocol messages as strings.

Future documents that define a new cost mode are strongly recommended to indicate whether that new cost mode applies to all or a subset of cost metrics. This recommendation is meant to prevent non-deterministic behaviors that may result in presenting a cost mode with a specific metric, while such an association does not make sense or can't be unambiguously interpreted by ALTO implementations.

If the definition of a cost mode does not indicate whether that cost mode applies to a subset of cost metrics, ALTO implementations MUST be prepared to accept that cost mode for any cost metric.

3.2. Updates to [Section 10.5 of RFC7285](#)

This document updates [Section 10.5 of \[RFC7285\]](#) as follows:

OLD:

A cost mode is encoded as a string. The string MUST have a value of either "numerical" or "ordinal".

NEW:

A cost mode is encoded as a string. The string MUST be no more than 32 characters, and it MUST NOT contain characters other than US-ASCII alphanumeric characters (U+0030-U+0039, U+0041-U+005A, and U+0061-U+007A), the hyphen-minus ('-', U+002D), the colon (':', U+003A), or the low line ('_', U+005F). Cost modes reserved for Private Use are prefixed with "priv:" ([Section 5](#)). Otherwise, the cost mode MUST have a value that is listed in the registry created in [Section 5](#) of RFCXXXX.

[4.](#) Backward Compatibility Considerations

ALTO servers that support new cost modes for specific cost metrics will use the mechanism specified in [Section 9.2 of \[RFC7285\]](#) to advertise their capabilities. ALTO clients (including legacy) will use that information to specify cost constraints in their requests (e.g., indicate a cost metric and a cost mode). An example of such a behavior is depicted in [Section 9.2.3 of \[RFC7285\]](#).

If an ALTO client includes a cost mode that is not supported by an ALTO server, the server indicates such an error with the error code E_INVALID_FIELD_VALUE as per [Section 8.5.2 of \[RFC7285\]](#). In practice, legacy ALTO servers will reply with the error code E_INVALID_FIELD_VALUE to requests that include a cost type other than "numerical" or "ordinal" for the "routingcost" cost metric.

The encoding constraints in [Section 3.2](#) do not introduce any interoperability issue given that currently implemented cost modes adhere to these constraints (mainly, those in [\[RFC7285\]](#) and [\[I-D.ietf-alto-path-vector\]](#)).

[5.](#) IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA to create a new subregistry entitled "ALTO Cost Modes" under the "Application-Layer Traffic Optimization (ALTO) Protocol" registry available at [\[ALTO\]](#).

The assignment policy for this subregistry is "IETF Review" ([Section 4.8 of \[RFC8126\]](#)).

Requests to register a new ALTO cost mode must include the following information:

Identifier: The name of the ALTO cost mode. Refer to [Section 3.2](#) for more details on allowed encoding.

Description: A short description of the requested ALTO cost mode.

Intended Semantics: A reference to where the semantic of the requested cost mode is defined.

Reference: A reference to the document that registers the requested cost mode.

Cost modes prefixed with "priv:" are reserved for Private Use ([Section 4.1 of \[RFC8126\]](#)). This document requests IANA to add the following note to the new subregistry:

Note: Identifiers prefixed with 'priv:' are reserved for Private Use (see [\[RFCXXXX\]](#), [Section 5](#)).

The subregistry is initially populated with the following values:

Identifier	Description	Intended Semantics	Reference
numerical	Indicates that numerical operations can be performed on the returned costs	Section 6.1.2.1 of RFC7285	RFCXXXX
ordinal	Indicates that the cost	Section	RFCXXXX

	values in a cost map	6.1.2.2 of	
	represent ranking	RFC7285	

6. Security Considerations

This document does not introduce new concerns other than those already discussed in [Section 15 of \[RFC7285\]](#).

7. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Benjamin Kaduk for spotting the issue during the review of [[I-D.ietf-alto-path-vector](#)].

Thanks to Adrian Farrel, Dhruv Dhody, Luis Miguel Contreras Murillo, Sabine Randriamasy, and Qiao Xiang for the review and comments.

Special thanks to Kai Gao for Shepherding the document.

Thanks to Martin Duke for the AD review.

Thanks to Roni Even for the gen-art review, Jaime Jimenez for the artart review, and Stephen Farrell for the secdir review.

Thanks to Robert Wilton, Lars Eggert, Francesca Palombini, Roman Danyliw, Paul Wouters, and Murray Kucherawy for the IESG review.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC7285] Alimi, R., Ed., Penno, R., Ed., Yang, Y., Ed., Kiesel, S., Previdi, S., Roome, W., Shalunov, S., and R. Woundy, "Application-Layer Traffic Optimization (ALTO) Protocol",

[RFC 7285](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7285, September 2014,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7285>>.

[RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

8.2. Informative References

[ALTO] "Application-Layer Traffic Optimization (ALTO) Protocol", 2 March 2022, <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/alto-protocol/alto-protocol.xhtml>>.

[I-D.ietf-alto-path-vector]
Gao, K., Lee, Y., Randriamasy, S., Yang, Y. R., and J. J. Zhang, "An ALTO Extension: Path Vector", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-alto-path-vector-25](#), 20 March 2022, <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-alto-path-vector-25.txt>>.

Authors' Addresses

Mohamed Boucadair
Orange
35000 Rennes
France
Email: mohamed.boucadair@orange.com

Qin Wu
Huawei
101 Software Avenue, Yuhua District
Nanjing
Jiangsu, 210012
China

