

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: February 25, 2012

K. Ogawa
NTT Corporation
W. M. Wang
Zhejiang Gongshang University
E. Haleplidis
University of Patras
J. Hadi Salim
Mojatatu Networks
August 24, 2011

ForCES Intra-NE High Availability
draft-ietf-forces-ceha-02

Abstract

This document discusses CE High Availability within a ForCES NE.

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 <http://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 February 25, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 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 (<http://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 Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as

Internet-Draft

ForCES Intra-NE High Availability

August 2011

described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Definitions | 3 |
| 2. | Introduction | 4 |
| 2.1. | Document Scope | 5 |
| 2.2. | Quantifying Problem Scope | 5 |
| 3. | RFC5810 CE HA Framework | 6 |
| 3.1. | Current CE High Availability Support | 6 |
| 3.1.1. | Cold Standby Interaction with ForCES Protocol | 7 |
| 3.1.2. | Responsibilities for HA | 9 |
| 4. | CE HA Hot Standby | 10 |
| 4.1. | Changes to the FEPO model | 10 |
| 4.2. | FEPO processing | 10 |
| 5. | IANA Considerations | 14 |
| 6. | Security Considerations | 14 |
| 7. | References | 14 |
| 7.1. | Normative References | 14 |
| 7.2. | Informative References | 15 |
| | Appendix 1. Appendix I - New FEPO version | 15 |
| | Authors' Addresses | 22 |

1. Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#).

The following definitions are taken from [\[RFC3654\]](#) and [\[RFC3746\]](#):

Logical Functional Block (LFB) -- A template that represents a fine-grained, logically separate aspects of FE processing.


ForCES Protocol -- The protocol used at the Fp reference point in the ForCES Framework in [\[RFC3746\]](#).

ForCES Protocol Layer (ForCES PL) -- A layer in the ForCES architecture that embodies the ForCES protocol and the state transfer mechanisms as defined in [\[RFC5810\]](#).

ForCES Protocol Transport Mapping Layer (ForCES TML) -- A layer in ForCES protocol architecture that specifically addresses the protocol message transportation issues, such as how the protocol messages are mapped to different transport media (like SCTP, IP, TCP, UDP, ATM, Ethernet, etc), and how to achieve and implement reliability, security, etc.

2. Introduction

Figure 1 illustrates a ForCES NE controlled by a set of redundant CEs with CE1 being active and CE2 and CEn-1 being a backup.



Fi/f

Fi/f

Fp: CE-FE interface
Fi: FE-FE interface
Fr: CE-CE interface
Fc: Interface between the CE Manager and a CE
Ff: Interface between the FE Manager and an FE
Fl: Interface between the CE Manager and the FE Manager
Fi/f: FE external interface

Figure 1: ForCES Architecture

The ForCES architecture allows FEs to be aware of multiple CEs but enforces that only one CE be the master controller. This is known in the industry as 1+N redundancy. The master CE controls the FEs via the ForCES protocol operating in the Fp interface. If the master CE becomes faulty, a backup CE takes over and NE operation continues. By definition, the current documented setup is known as cold-standby. The CE set is static and is passed to the FE by the FE Manager (FEM)

Ogawa, et al.

Expires February 25, 2012

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

ForCES Intra-NE High Availability

August 2011

via the Ff interface and to each CE by the CE Manager (CEM) in the Fc interface during the pre-association phase.

From an FE perspective, the knobs of control for a CE set are defined by the FEPO LFB in [\[RFC5810\]](#), [Appendix B](#). [Section 3.1](#) of this document details these knobs further.

[2.1](#). Document Scope

It is assumed that the reader is aware of the ForCES architecture to make sense of the changes made here. This document provides minimal background to set the context of the discussion in [Section 4](#).

By current definition, the Fr interface is out of scope for the ForCES architecture. However, it is expected that organizations implementing a set of CEs will need to have the CEs communicate to each other via the Fr interface in order to achieve the synchronization necessary for controlling the FEs.

The problem scope addressed by this document falls into 2 areas:

1. To describe with more clarity (than [\[RFC5810\]](#)) how current cold-

standby approach operates within the NE cluster.

2. To describe how to evolve the cold-standby setup to a hot-standby redundancy setup so as to improve the failover time and NE availability.

[2.2.](#) Quantifying Problem Scope

The NE recovery and availability is dependent on several time-sensitive metrics:

1. How fast the CE plane failure is detected the FE.
2. How fast a backup CE becomes operational.
3. How fast the FEs associate with the new master CE.
4. How fast the FEs recover their state and become operational.

The design goals of the current [[RFC5810](#)] choices to meet the above goals are driven by desire for simplicity.

To quantify the above criteria with the current prescribed ForCES CE setup in [[RFC5810](#)]:

1. How fast the CE side detects a CE failure is left undefined. To illustrate an extreme scenario, we could have a human operator acting as the monitoring entity to detect faulty CEs. How fast such detection happens could be in the range of seconds to days. A more active monitor on the Fr interface could improve this detection.
2. How fast the backup CE becomes operational is also currently out of scope. In the current setup, a backup CE need not be operational at all (for example, to save power) and therefore it is feasible for a monitoring entity to boot up a backup CE after it detects the failure of the master CE. In this document [Section 4](#) we suggest that at least one backup CE be online so as to improve this metric.

3. How fast an FE associates with new master CE is also currently undefined. The cost of an FE connecting and associating adds to the recovery overhead. As mentioned above we suggest having at least one backup CE online. In [Section 4](#) we propose to zero out the connection and association cost on failover by having each FE associate with all online backup CEs after associating to the active CE. Note that if an FE pre-associates with backup CEs, then the system will be technically operating in hot-standby mode.
4. And last: How fast an FE recovers its state depends on how much NE state exists. By ForCES current definition, the new master CE assumes zero state on the FE and starts from scratch to update the FE. So the larger the state, the longer the recovery.

[3. RFC5810](#) CE HA Framework

To achieve CE High Availability, FEs and CEs MUST inter-operate per [\[RFC5810\]](#) definition which is repeated for contextual reasons in [Section 3.1](#). It should be noted that in this default setup, which MUST be implemented by CEs and FEs needing HA, the Fr plane is out of scope (and if available is proprietary to an implementation).

[3.1](#). Current CE High Availability Support

As mentioned earlier, although there can be multiple redundant CEs, only one CE actively controls FEs in a ForCES NE. In practice there may be only one backup CE. At any moment in time only one master CE can control the FEs. In addition, the FE connects and associates to only the master CE. The FE and the CE PL are aware of the primary and one or more secondary CEs. This information (primary, secondary CEs) is configured on the FE and the CE PLs during pre-association by

the FEM and the CEM respectively.

Figure 2 below illustrates the Forces message sequences that the FE uses to recover the connection in current defined cold-standby scheme.




Figure 2: CE Failover for Cold Standby

3.1.1. Cold Standby Interaction with ForCES Protocol

High Availability parameterization in an FE is driven by configuring the FE Protocol Object (FEPO) LFB.

The FEPO CEID component identifies the current master CE and the component table BackupCEs identifies the backup CEs. The FEPO FE Heartbeat Interval, CE Heartbeat Dead Interval, and CE Heartbeat policy help in detecting connectivity problems between an FE and CE. The CE Failover policy defines how the FE should react on a detected failure.

Figure 3 illustrates the defined state machine that facilitates connection recovery.

The FE connects to the CE specified on FEPO CEID component. If it fails to connect to the defined CE, it moves it to the bottom of

table BackupCEs and sets its CEID component to be the first CE

retrieved from table BackupCEs. The FE then attempts to associate with the CE designated as the new primary CE. The FE continues through this procedure until it successfully connects to one of the CEs.




Figure 3: FE State Machine considering HA

When communication fails between the FE and CE (which can be caused by either the CE or link failure but not FE related), either the TML on the FE will trigger the FE PL regarding this failure or it will be detected using the HB messages between FEs and CEs. The communication failure, regardless of how it is detected, MUST be considered as a loss of association between the CE and corresponding FE.

If the FE's FEPO CE Failover Policy is configured to mode 0 (the default), it will immediately transition to the pre-association phase. This means that if association is again established, all FE

state will need to be re-established.

If the FE's FEPO CE Failover Policy is configured to mode 1, it indicates that the FE is capable of HA restart recovery. In such a case, the FE transitions to the Not Associated state and the CEFTI timer[RFC 5810] is started. The FE MAY continue to forward packets during this state. It MAY also recycle through any configured backup CEs in a round-robin fashion. It first adds its primary CE to the bottom of table BackupCEs and sets its CEID component to be the first secondary retrieved from table BackupCEs. The FE then attempts to associate with the CE designated as the new primary CE. If it fails to re-associate with any CE and the CEFTI expires, the FE then transitions to the pre-association state.

If the FE, while in the not associated state, manages to reconnect to a new primary CE before CEFTI expires it transitions to the Associated state. Once re-associated, the FE tries to recover any state that may have been lost during the not associated state. How the FE re-synchronizes state is out of scope for the current ForCES architecture.

An explicit message (a Config message setting Primary CE component in ForCES Protocol object) from the primary CE, can also be used to change the Primary CE for an FE during normal protocol operation. In this case, the FE transitions to the Not Associated State and attempts to Associate with the new CE.

[3.1.2](#). Responsibilities for HA

TML Level:

1. The TML controls logical connection availability and failover.
2. The TML also controls peer HA management.

At this level, control of all lower layers, for example transport level (such as IP addresses, MAC addresses etc) and associated links going down are the role of the TML.

PL Level:

All other functionality, including configuring the HA behavior during setup, the CE IDs used to identify primary and secondary CEs, protocol messages used to report CE failure (Event Report), Heartbeat messages used to detect association failure, messages to change the primary CE (Config), and other HA related operations described in [Section 3.1](#), are the PL's responsibility.

To put the two together, if a path to a primary CE is down, the TML

would take care of failing over to a backup path, if one is available. If the CE is totally unreachable then the PL would be informed and it would take the appropriate actions described before.

[4.](#) CE HA Hot Standby

In this section we describe small extensions to the existing scheme to enable hot standby HA. To achieve hot standby HA, we target specific goals defined in [Section 2.2](#), namely:

- o How fast a backup CE becomes operational.
- o How fast the FEs associate with the new master CE.

As described in [Section 3.1](#), in the pre-association phase the FEM configures the FE to make it aware of all the CEs in the NE. The FEM MUST configure the FE to make it aware of which CE is the master and MAY specify any backup CE(s).

[4.1.](#) Changes to the FEPO model

In order for the above to be achievable there is a need to make a few changes in the FEPO model. [Section 1](#) contains the xml definition of the new version 2 of the FEPO LFB.

Changes from the version 1 of FEPO are:


1. Addition of a new datatype, status (unsigned char) with special values 0 (Disconnected), 1 (Connected), 2 (Associated), 3 (Lost_Connection) and 4 (Unreachable).
2. Change Component BackupCEs (9) to AllCEs and instead of an Array of unsigned integers(CEID), it MUST be an Array of unsigned integers (CEID) and unsigned char (status) for each CE.
3. Add two special values to the CEFailoverPolicyValues. 2 (High availability without Graceful restart) and 3 (High availability with Graceful restart).

4.2. FEPO processing


The FE's FEPO LFB version 2 AllCEs table (previously BackupCEs) contains all the CEIDs that the FE may connect and associate with. The ordering of the CE IDs in this table defines the priority order in which an FE will connect to the CEs. In the pre-association phase, the first CE ID (lowest table index) in the AllCEs table MUST be the first CE ID that the FE will attempt to connect and associate

with. If the FE fails to connect and associate with the first CE ID, it will attempt to connect to the second CE ID and so forth, and cycles back to the beginning of the list until there is a connection and an association. The FE MUST associate with at least one CE. Upon a successful association, the FEPO's CEID component identifies the current associated master CE.

Once the FE has associated with a master CE it moves to the post-association phase. In the post-association phase, the master CE MAY update the list of backup CEs. It MAY also instruct the FE to use a different master CE. It is assumed that the master CE will communicate with other CEs within the NE for the purpose of synchronization via the CE-CE interface. The CE-CE interface is out of scope for this document.



The new master CE MUST configure the CEID component of the FE within the time limit defined in the FEPO Failover Timeout as a confirmation that the FE made the right choice.






Figure 5: CE Failover for Hot Standby

If the FE does not get confirmation within the FEPO Failover Timeout, it picks the next CE on its list and advertises it as the new master. Figure 5 illustrates in step #5 selecting CE#2 as its new master. In step #6, the timeout occurs and it picks CE#N as its new master. The FE receives confirmation that CE#N is the new master in step #7.

If the CE the FE assumed to be the master discovers that it should not be the new master CE, then it will configure the CEID with the ID of the proper master CE. How the CE decides who the new master CE is, is also out of scope of this document and is assumed to be done via a CE-CE communication protocol. The FE must then associate with

then new CE.

In most High Availability architectures there exists the possibility of split-brain. However, since in our setup the FE will never accept any configuration messages from any other than the master CE, we consider the FE as fenced against data corruption from the other CEs that consider themselves as the master. The split-brain issue becomes mostly a CE-CE communication problem which is considered to be out of scope.

By virtue of having multiple CE connections, the FE switchover to a

new master CE will be relatively much faster. The overall effect is improving the NE recovery time in case of communication failure or faults of the master CE. This satisfies the requirement we set to achieve.

For the sake of simplicity, the FE MUST respond to messages issued only by the master CE. This simplifies the synchronization and avoids the concept of locking FE state. The FE MUST drop any messages from backup CEs. However, asynchronous events that the master CE has subscribed to, as well as heartbeats are sent to all associated-to CEs. Packet redirects continue to be sent only to the master CE. The Heartbeat Interval, the CEHB Policy and the FEHB Policy MUST be the same for all CEs.

5. IANA Considerations

TBA

6. Security Considerations

TBA

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC5810] Doria, A., Hadi Salim, J., Haas, R., Khosravi, H., Wang, W., Dong, L., Gopal, R., and J. Halpern, "Forwarding and Control Element Separation (ForCES) Protocol Specification", [RFC 5810](#), March 2010.

7.2. Informative References

- [RFC3654] Khosravi, H. and T. Anderson, "Requirements for Separation of IP Control and Forwarding", [RFC 3654](#), November 2003.

[RFC3746] Yang, L., Dantu, R., Anderson, T., and R. Gopal, "Forwarding and Control Element Separation (ForCES) Framework", [RFC 3746](#), April 2004.

[RFC5812] Halpern, J. and J. Hadi Salim, "Forwarding and Control Element Separation (ForCES) Forwarding Element Model", [RFC 5812](#), March 2010.

1. Appendix I - New FEPO version

XXX: Describe this to conform to LFB extensions as prescribed in the model

```
<LFBLibrary xmlns="http://ietf.org/forces/1.0/lfbmodel"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xsi:schemaLocation="http://ietf.org/forces/1.0/lfbmodel D:\Workspace\Fo
  provides="FEPO">
  <!-- XXX -->
  <dataTypeDefs>
    <dataTypeDef>
      <name>CEHBPolicyValues</name>
      <synopsis>
        The possible values of CE heartbeat policy
      </synopsis>
      <atomic>
      <baseType>uchar</baseType>
      <specialValues>
        <specialValue value="0">
          <name>CEHBPolicy0</name>
          <synopsis>
            The CE heartbeat policy 0
          </synopsis>
        </specialValue>
        <specialValue value="1">
          <name>CEHBPolicy1</name>
          <synopsis>
            The CE heartbeat policy 1
          </synopsis>
        </specialValue>
      </specialValues>
      </atomic>
    </dataTypeDef>
```

```
<dataTypeDef>
  <name>FEHBPolicyValues</name>
  <synopsis>
    The possible values of FE heartbeat policy
  </synopsis>
  <atomic>
  <baseType>uchar</baseType>
  <specialValues>
    <specialValue value="0">
      <name>FEHBPolicy0</name>
      <synopsis>
        The FE heartbeat policy 0
      </synopsis>
    </specialValue>
    <specialValue value="1">
      <name>FEHBPolicy1</name>
      <synopsis>
        The FE heartbeat policy 1
      </synopsis>
    </specialValue>
  </specialValues>
  </atomic>
</dataTypeDef>
<dataTypeDef>
<name>FERestartPolicyValues</name>
  <synopsis>
    The possible values of FE restart policy
  </synopsis>
  <atomic>
  <baseType>uchar</baseType>
  <specialValues>
    <specialValue value="0">
      <name>FERestartPolicy0</name>
      <synopsis>
        The FE restart policy 0
      </synopsis>
    </specialValue>
  </specialValues>
  </atomic>
</dataTypeDef>
<dataTypeDef>
<name>CEFailoverPolicyValues</name>
  <synopsis>
    The possible values of CE failover policy
  </synopsis>
  <atomic>
  <baseType>uchar</baseType>
```

<specialValues>

Internet-Draft

ForCES Intra-NE High Availability

August 2011

```
<specialValue value="0">
  <name>CEFailoverPolicy0</name>
  <synopsis>
    The CE failover policy 0
    No High Availability or Graceful Restart.
  </synopsis>
</specialValue>
<specialValue value="1">
  <name>CEFailoverPolicy1</name>
  <synopsis>
    Graceful Restart
  </synopsis>
</specialValue>
<specialValue value="2">
  <name>CEFailoverPolicy2</name>
  <synopsis>
    High Availability without Graceful Restart
  </synopsis>
</specialValue>
<specialValue value="3">
  <name>CEFailoverPolicy3</name>
  <synopsis>
    High Availability with Graceful Restart
  </synopsis>
</specialValue>
</specialValues>
</atomic>
</dataTypeDef>
<dataTypeDef>
  <name>FEHACapab</name>
  <synopsis>
    The supported HA features
  </synopsis>
<atomic>
  <baseType>uchar</baseType>
  <specialValues>
    <specialValue value="0">
      <name>GracefullRestart</name>
      <synopsis>
        The FE supports Graceful Restart
```

```
</synopsis>
</specialValue>
<specialValue value="1">
  <name>HA</name>
  <synopsis>
    The FE supports HA
  </synopsis>
</specialValue>
```

```
</specialValues>
</atomic>
</dataTypeDef>
<dataTypeDef>
<name>CEStatusType</name>
  <synopsis>
    Status values. Status for each CE.
  </synopsis>
  <atomic>
  <baseType>uchar</baseType>
<specialValues>
  <specialValue value="0">
    <name>Disconnected</name>
    <synopsis>
      No connection attempt with the CE yet.
    </synopsis>
  </specialValue>
  <specialValue value="1">
    <name>Connected</name>
    <synopsis>
      The FE has connected with the CE.
    </synopsis>
  </specialValue>
  <specialValue value="2">
    <name>Associated</name>
    <synopsis>
      The FE has associated with the CE.
    </synopsis>
  </specialValue>
  <specialValue value="3">
    <name>Lost_Connection</name>
    <synopsis>
      The FE was associated with the CE
```

```

        but lost the connection.
    </synopsis>
</specialValue>
<specialValue value="4">
    <name>Unreachable</name>
    <synopsis>
        The CE is deemed as unreachable by the FE.
    </synopsis>
</specialValue>
</specialValues>
    </atomic>
</dataTypeDef>
<dataTypeDef>
    <name>AllCEType</name>
    <synopsis>

```

```

        Table Type for AllCE component.
    </synopsis>
<struct>
    <component componentID="1">
        <name>CEID</name>
        <synopsis>ID of the CE</synopsis>
        <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
    </component>
    <component componentID="2">
        <name>CEStatus</name>
        <synopsis>Status of the CE</synopsis>
        <typeRef>CEStatusType</typeRef>
    </component>
</struct>
</dataTypeDef>
</dataTypeDefs>
<LFBClassDefs>
    <LFBClassDef LFBClassID="2">
        <name>FEPO</name>
        <synopsis>
            The FE Protocol Object
        </synopsis>
        <version>2.0</version>
    </LFBClassDef>
</LFBClassDefs>
<components>
    <component componentID="1" access="read-only">
        <name>CurrentRunningVersion</name>
    </component>

```

```

    <synopsis>Currently running ForCES version</synopsis>
    <typeRef>u8</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="2" access="read-only">
    <name>FEID</name>
    <synopsis>Unicast FEID</synopsis>
    <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="3" access="read-write">
    <name>MulticastFEIDs</name>
    <synopsis>
        the table of all multicast IDs
    </synopsis>
    <array type="variable-size">
        <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
    </array>
</component>
<component componentID="4" access="read-write">
    <name>CEHBPolicy</name>
    <synopsis>
        The CE Heartbeat Policy
    </synopsis>

```

```

    <typeRef>CEHBPolicyValues</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="5" access="read-write">
    <name>CEHDI</name>
    <synopsis>
        The CE Heartbeat Dead Interval in millisecs
    </synopsis>
    <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="6" access="read-write">
    <name>FEHBPolicy</name>
    <synopsis>
        The FE Heartbeat Policy
    </synopsis>
    <typeRef>FEHBPolicyValues</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="7" access="read-write">
    <name>FEHI</name>
    <synopsis>

```

```

    The FE Heartbeat Interval in millisecs
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="8" access="read-write">
  <name>CEID</name>
  <synopsis>
    The Primary CE this FE is associated with
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="9" access="read-write">
  <name>AllCEs</name>
  <synopsis>
    The table of all CEs.
  </synopsis>
  <array type="variable-size">
    <typeRef>AllCEType</typeRef>
  </array>
</component>
<component componentID="10" access="read-write">
  <name>CEFailoverPolicy</name>
  <synopsis>
    The CE Failover Policy
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>CEFailoverPolicyValues</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="11" access="read-write">
  <name>CEFTI</name>

```

```

  <synopsis>
    The CE Failover Timeout Interval in millisecs
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
<component componentID="12" access="read-write">
  <name>FERestartPolicy</name>
  <synopsis>
    The FE Restart Policy
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>FERestartPolicyValues</typeRef>
</component>

```

```

<component componentID="13" access="read-write">
  <name>LastCEID</name>
  <synopsis>
    The Primary CE this FE was last associated with
  </synopsis>
  <typeRef>uint32</typeRef>
</component>
</components>
<capabilities>
  <capability componentID="30">
    <name>SupportableVersions</name>
    <synopsis>
      the table of ForCES versions that FE supports
    </synopsis>
    <array type="variable-size">
      <typeRef>u8</typeRef>
    </array>
  </capability>
  <capability componentID="31">
    <name>HACapabilities</name>
    <synopsis>
      the table of HA capabilities the FE supports
    </synopsis>
    <array type="variable-size">
      <typeRef>FEHACapab</typeRef>
    </array>
  </capability>
</capabilities>
<events baseID="61">
  <event eventID="1">
    <name>PrimaryCEDown</name>
    <synopsis>
      The primary CE has changed
    </synopsis>
    <eventTarget>
      <eventField>LastCEID</eventField>

```

```

</eventTarget>
<eventChanged/>
<eventReports>
  <eventReport>
    <eventField>LastCEID</eventField>

```



```
</eventReport>
</eventReports>
</event>
</events>
</LFBClassDef>
</LFBClassDefs>
</LFBLibrary>
```

Authors' Addresses

Kentaro Ogawa
NTT Corporation
3-9-11 Midori-cho
Musashino-shi, Tokyo 180-8585
Japan

Email: ogawa.kentaro@lab.ntt.co.jp

Weiming Wang
Zhejiang Gongshang University
149 Jiaogong Road
Hangzhou 310035
P.R.China

Phone: +86-571-88057712
Email: wmwang@mail.zjgsu.edu.cn

Evangelos Haleplidis
University of Patras
Patras
Greece

Email: ehalep@ece.upatras.gr

Jamal Hadi Salim
Mojatatu Networks
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada

Email: hadi@mojatatu.com

