

Policy Framework Working Group
INTERNET-DRAFT
Category: Informational

A. Westerinen
J. Schnizlein
J. Strassner
Cisco Systems
Mark Scherling
xCert
Bob Quinn
Celox Networks
Jay Perry
CPlane
Shai Herzog
IP Highway
An-Ni Huynh
Lucent Technologies
Mark Carlson
Sun Microsystems
Steve Waldbusser
November 2000

Policy Terminology

[<draft-ietf-policy-terminology-01.txt>](#)

Friday, November 24, 2000, 12:03 AM

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Copyright Notice

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

Abstract

This document is a glossary of policy-related terms. It provides abbreviations, explanations, and recommendations for use of these terms. The document takes the approach and format of [RFC2828](#) [[R2828](#)], which defines an Internet Security Glossary. The intent is to improve the comprehensibility and consistency of writing that deals with network policy, particularly Internet Standards documents (ISDs).

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Explanation of Paragraph Markings.....	4
3.	Terms.....	4
4.	Intellectual Property.....	15
5.	Acknowledgements.....	16
6.	Security Considerations.....	16
7.	References.....	16
8.	Authors' Addresses.....	18
9.	Full Copyright Statement.....	20

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

1. Introduction

This document provides abbreviations, definitions, and explanations of terms related to network policy. All definitions are provided in [Section 3](#), with the terms listed in alphabetical order.

The intent is to improve the comprehensibility and consistency of Internet Standards documents (ISDs) - i.e., RFCs, Internet-Drafts, and other material produced as part of the Internet Standards Process [[R2026](#)]. Benefits across the ISDs are well-stated in the Introduction to [RFC2828](#) [[R2828](#)]:

- o "Clear, Concise, and Easily Understood Documentation" - Requires that the set of terms and definitions be consistent, self-supporting and uniform across all ISDs.
- o Technical Excellence - Where all ISDs use terminology accurately, precisely, and unambiguously.
- o Prior Implementation and Testing - Requires that terms are used in their plainest form, that private and "made-up" terms are avoided in ISDs, and that new definitions are not created that conflict with established ones.
- o "Openness, Fairness, and Timeliness" - Where ISDs avoid terms that are proprietary or otherwise favor a particular vendor, or that create a bias toward a particular technology or mechanism.

Common and/or controversial policy terms are defined in this draft.

These terms are directly related and specific to network policy. This is a "living" document that is expected to grow over the next several months, as the current terms are reviewed and additional words suggested for inclusion.

Wherever possible, this draft takes definitions from existing ISDs. It should be noted that:

- o Expired Internet-Drafts are not referenced, nor are their terminology and definitions used in this document.
- o Multiple definitions may exist across the ISDs. Each definition will be listed, with its source.

Where definitions are contradictory, the recommendations of the draft editors are presented. The draft editors will work with other ISD authors to remove contradictions.

2. Explanation of Paragraph Markings

Section 3 marks terms and definitions as follows:

- o Capitalization: Only terms that are proper nouns are capitalized.
- o Paragraph Marking: Definitions and explanations are stated in paragraphs that are marked as follows:
 - "P" identifies basic policy-related terms.
 - "T" identifies various techniques to create or convey policy-related information in a network. For example, COPS and an "Information Model" are two techniques for communicating and describing policy-related data.
 - "A" identifies specific Work Groups and general "areas of use" of policy. For example, AAA and QoS are two "areas of use" where policy concepts are extremely important to their function and operation.

3. Terms

Note: In providing policy definitions, other "technology specific" terms (for example, related to Differentiated Services) may be used and referenced. These non-policy terms will not be defined in this document, and the reader is requested to go to the referenced ISD for additional detail.

\$ AAA

See "Authentication, Authorization, Accounting."

\$ abstraction levels

See "policy abstraction."

\$ action

See "policy action."

\$ Authentication, Authorization, Accounting (AAA)

(A) AAA efforts in the IETF have focused on the most widely deployed use of authentication: Remote Authentication Dial In User Service (RADIUS), and its expansion in Diameter (a "radius" pun and not an acronym) [[DIAMETER](#)]. Referencing the RADIUS RFC [[R2138](#)], a network access server sends dial-user credentials to a AAA server, and receives authentication that the user is who he/she claims along with a set of attribute-value pairs authorizing various service features for that user. Policy is implied in both the authentication, which can be restricted by time of day, number of sessions, calling number, etc., and the attribute-values authorized.

\$ CIM

See "Common Information Model."

\$ Common Information Model (CIM)

(T) An object-oriented information model published by the DMTF (Distributed Management Task Force) [[DMTF](#)]. It consists of a Specification detailing the abstract modeling constructs and principles of the Information Model, and a textual language definition to represent the Model. CIM's schemas are defined as a set of files, written in the language of the Specification, with graphical renderings using UML [[UML](#)]. Sets of classes and associations represent CIM's Core and Common Models, defining an

information model for the "enterprise" - addressing general concepts (in Core), and systems, devices, users, software distribution, the physical environment, networks and policy (in the Common Models). (See also "information model.")

\$ Common Open Policy Service (COPS)

(T) A simple query and response TCP-based protocol that can be used to exchange policy information between a Policy Decision Point (PDP) and its clients (Policy Enforcement Points, PEPs). [[RFC 2748](#)] (See also "Policy Decision Point" and "Policy Enforcement Point.")

\$ condition

See "policy condition."

\$ configuration

(P) "Configuration" can be defined from two perspectives:

- The set of parameters in network elements and other systems that determine their function and operation. Some parameters are static, such as packet queue assignment and can be predefined and downloaded to a network element. Others are more dynamic, such as the actions taken by a network device upon the occurrence of some event. The distinction between static (predefined) "configuration" and the dynamic state of network elements blurs as setting parameters becomes more responsive, and signaling controls greater degrees of a network device's behavior.
- A static setup of a network element, done before shipment to a customer and which cannot be modified by the customer.

The first is the accepted usage in the Internet community.

\$ COPS

See "Common Open Policy Service."

\$ data model

(T) A mapping of the contents of an information model into a form that is specific to a particular type of data store or repository. A "data model" is basically the rendering of an information model according to a specific set of mechanisms for

representing, organizing, storing and handling data. It has three parts [[DecSupp](#)]:

- A collection of data structures such as lists, tables,

relations, etc.

- A collection of operations that can be applied to the structures such as retrieval, update, summation, etc.
- A collection of integrity rules that define the legal states (set of values) or changes of state (operations on values). (See also "information model.")

\$ DEN

See "Directory Enabled Networks."

\$ Differentiated Services (DS)

(T) The IP header field, called the DS-field. In IPv4, it defines the layout of the ToS (Type of Service) octet; in IPv6, it is the Traffic Class octet. [[R2474](#), [DSTERMS](#)]

(A) "Differentiated Services" is also an "area of use" for QoS policies. It requires policy to define the correspondence between codepoints in the packet's DS-field and individual per-hop behaviors (to achieve a specified per-domain behavior). (See also "Quality of Service.")

\$ diffserv

See "Differentiated Services."

\$ Directory Enabled Networks (DEN)

(T) A data model that is the LDAP mapping of CIM (the Common Information Model). Its goals are to enable the deployment and use of policy by starting with common service and user concepts (defined in the information model), specifying their mapping/storage in an LDAP-based repository, and using these concepts in vendor/device-independent policy rules. [[DMTF](#)] (See also "Common Information Model" and "data model.")

\$ domain

See "policy domain."

\$ DS

See "Differentiated Services."

\$ filter

(T) A set of terms and/or criteria used for the purpose of separating or categorizing. "Filters" are often manipulated and used in network policy.

- Packet filters are defined in [[FrameworkPIB](#), [DiffServPIB](#)].

They specify the criteria for matching a pattern (for example, IP or 802 traffic criteria) to appear in packets belonging to flows, e.g. microflows or behavior aggregates. Associated with each filter is a permit/deny flag.

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

\$ goal

See "policy goal."

\$ information model

(T) An abstraction and representation of the entities in a managed environment, their properties, attributes and operations, and the way that they relate to each other. It is independent of any specific repository, application, protocol, or platform.

\$ MIB

See "Policy Management Information Base."

\$ MPLS

See "Multiprotocol Label Switching."

\$ Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS)

(T) Integrates a label swapping and switching framework with network layer routing [[R2702](#)]. The basic idea involves assigning short fixed length labels to packets at the ingress to an MPLS cloud. Throughout the interior of the MPLS domain, the labels attached to packets are used to make forwarding decisions (usually without recourse to the original packet headers).

\$ outsourced policy

(P) An execution model where a policy enforcement device issues a query to delegate a decision for a specific policy event to another component, external to it. For example, in RSVP, the arrival of a new RSVP message to a PEP requires a fast policy decision (not to delay the end-to-end setup). The PEP may use COPS-RSVP to send a query to the PDP, asking for a policy decision. [[R2205](#), [R2748](#)] "Outsourced policy" is contrasted with "provisioned policy", but they are not mutually exclusive and operational systems may combine the two.

\$ PCIM

See "Policy Core Information Model."

\$ PDP

See "Policy Decision Point."

\$ PEP

See "Policy Enforcement Point."

\$ PIB

See "Policy Information Base."

\$ policy

(P) "Policy" can be defined from two perspectives:

- A definite goal, course or method of action to guide and determine present and future decisions. "Policies" are

implemented or executed within a particular context (such as policies defined within a business unit).

- Policies as a set of rules to administer, manage, and control access to network resources. [[PCIM](#)]

Note that these two views are not contradictory since individual rules may be defined in support of business goals. (See also "policy goal", "policy abstraction" and "policy rule.")

\$ policy abstraction

(P) Policy can be represented at different levels, ranging from business goals to device-specific configuration parameters. Translation between different levels of "abstraction" may require information, other than policy, such as network and host parameter configuration and capabilities. Various documents and implementations may specify explicit levels of abstraction [for example, DiffPolicy]. However, these do not necessarily correspond to distinct processing entities or the complete set of levels in all environments. (See also "configuration" and "policy translation.")

\$ policy action

(P) Definition of what is to be done to enforce a policy rule, when the conditions of the rule are met. Policy actions may result in the execution of one or more operations to affect and/or configure network traffic and network resources.

- In [[PCIM](#)], a rule's actions may be ordered.

\$ policy condition

(P) An expression used to determine whether a policy rule's actions should be performed. When the set of conditions associated with a policy rule evaluates to TRUE, then the rule should be enforced. A condition may be defined as the occurrence of an event, or a computed expression typically consisting of three elements: a variable, an operator and another variable or constant. [[QoSModel](#)] Some of these elements may be implicit in

an implementation or protocol.

- In [[PCIM](#)], a rule's conditions can be expressed as either an ORed set of ANDed sets of statements (disjunctive normal form), or an ANDed set of ORed sets of statements (conjunctive normal form). Individual condition statements can also be negated.

\$ policy conflict

(P) Occurs when the actions of two rules (that are both satisfied simultaneously) contradict each other. The entity implementing the policy would not be able to determine which action to perform. The implementers of policy systems must provide conflict detection and avoidance or resolution mechanisms to prevent this situation. "Policy conflict" is contrasted with "policy error."

Westerinen, et al.

Expires: Nov 2000 + 6 months

[Page 8]

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

\$ policy conversion

See "policy translation."

\$ Policy Core Information Model (PCIM)

(T) An information model describing the basic concepts of policy groups, rules, conditions, actions, repositories and their relationships. This model is described as a "core" model since it cannot be applied without domain-specific extensions (for example, extensions for QoS or IPsec). PCIM is "core" with respect to the area of policy. However, it is a "Common Model," with respect to CIM - in that it extends the basic CIM concepts for policy. (See also "Common Information Model")

\$ policy decision

(P) Two perspectives of "policy decision" exist:

- A "process" perspective that deals with the evaluation of a policy rule's conditions
- A "result" perspective that deals with the actions for enforcement, when the conditions of a policy rule are TRUE

\$ Policy Decision Point (PDP)

(P) A logical entity that makes policy decisions for itself or for other network elements that request such decisions. [[R2753](#)]

(See also "policy decision.")

\$ policy domain

(P) A contiguous portion of an Internet over which a consistent

set of [...] policies are administered in a coordinated fashion. [R2474] This definition of a policy domain does not preclude multiple sources of policy creation within an organization, but does require that the resultant policies be coordinated. The definition given in RFC 2474 for Differentiated Services is very close to that of a security domain, defined in [SPSL]. In [SPSL], it is stated: "A security domain is defined as a connected set of network entities that are protected by policy enforcement points (PEP) placed on every communication path going through the perimeter of the domain. Every policy enforcement point of the domain works to enforce the common set of security policies associated with the domain."

\$ policy enforcement

(P) The execution of a policy decision.

\$ Policy Enforcement Point (PEP)

(P) A logical entity that enforces policy decisions. [R2753] (See also "policy enforcement.")

\$ policy error

(P) "Policy errors" occur when attempts to enforce policy actions fail, whether due to temporary state or permanent mismatch between the policy actions and the device enforcement capabilities. This is contrasted with "policy conflict."

\$ policy goal

(P) Goals are the business objectives or desired state intended to be maintained by a policy system. As the highest level of abstraction of policy, these goals are most directly described in business rather than technical terms. For example, a goal might state that a particular application operate on a network as though it had its own dedicated network, despite using a shared infrastructure. 'Policy goals' can include the objectives of a service level agreement, as well as the assignment of resources to applications or individuals. A policy system may be created that automatically strives to achieve a goal through feedback regarding whether the goal (such as a service level) is being met.

\$ Policy Information Base (PIB)

(T) Collections of related PProvisioning Classes (PRCs), defined as a module. [FrameworkPIB] (See also "PProvisioning Class")

\$ Policy Management Information Base (MIB)

(T) Collections of policy-related managed objects, defined as a module and accessed via an SNMP framework. [[PolicyMIB](#)]

\$ policy mapping

See "policy translation."

\$ policy negotiation

(P) Exposing the desired or appropriate part of a policy to another domain. This is necessary to support partial interconnection between domains, which are operating with different sets of policies. The need for "policy negotiation" is described in the IPsec Policy Working Group charter [[IPSP](#)]: "4) adopt or develop a policy exchange and negotiation protocol. The protocol must be capable of: i) discovering policy servers, ii) distributing and negotiating security policies, and; iii) resolving policy conflicts in both intra/inter domain environments."

\$ policy repository

(P) "Policy repository" can be defined from three perspectives:

- A specific data store that holds policy rules, their conditions and actions, and related policy data. A directory would be an example of such a store.
- A logical container representing the administrative scope and naming of policy rules, their conditions and actions, and related policy data. A QoS policy domain would be an example of such a container. [[QoSModel](#)]
- In [[PCIM](#)], a more restrictive definition than the prior one exists. PolicyRepository is a model abstraction representing an administratively defined, logical container for reusable policy conditions and policy actions.

\$ policy request

(P) Sent by a PEP to a PDP, it is more accurately qualified as a "policy decision request." [[R2753](#)] (See also "policy decision.")

\$ policy rule

(P) A basic building block of a policy-based system. It is the binding of a set of actions to a set of conditions - where the conditions are evaluated to determine whether the actions are performed. [[PCIM](#)]

\$ policy server

(P) A marketing term whose definition is imprecise. Originally, [\[R2753\]](#) referenced a "policy server." As the RFC evolved, this term became more precise and known as the Policy Decision Point (PDP). Today, the term is used in marketing and other literature to refer specifically to a PDP, or for any entity that uses/services policy.

\$ policy translation

(P) The transformation of a policy from a representation and/or level of abstraction, to another representation or level of abstraction. For example, it may be necessary to convert PIB data to a command line format. In this "conversion," the translation to the new representation is likely to require a change in the level of abstraction (becoming more or less specific). Although these are logically distinct tasks, they are (in most cases) blurred in the act of translating/converting/mapping. Therefore, this is also known as "policy conversion" or "policy mapping."

\$ PolicyGroup

(T) An abstraction in the Policy Core Information Model [\[PCIM\]](#). It is a class representing a container, aggregating either policy rules or other policy groups. It allows the grouping of rules into a Policy, and the refinement of high-level Policies to lower-level or different (i.e., converted or translated) peer groups.

\$ PolicyRepository

(T) An abstraction in the Policy Core Information Model [\[PCIM\]](#). It is a class representing an administratively defined, logical container for reusable policy conditions and policy actions. (See also "policy repository.")

\$ PRC

See "PRovisioning Class."

\$ PRI

See "PRovisioning Instance."

\$ provisioned policy

(P) An execution model where network elements are pre-configured,

based on policy, prior to processing events. Configuration is pushed to the network device, e.g., based on time of day or at initial booting of the device. The focus of this model is on the distribution of configuration information, and is exemplified by Differentiated Services [R2475]. Based on events received, devices use downloaded (pre-provisioned) mechanisms to implement policy. "Provisioned policy" is contrasted with "outsourced policy."

\$ PProvisioning Class (PRC)

(T) An ordered set of attributes representing a type of policy data. PRCs are defined in PIB modules (encoded using SPPI) and registered in the Object Identifier tree. Instances of each PRC are organized in tables, similar to conceptual tables in SMIV2. [R2578, FrameworkPIB] (See also "Structure of Policy Provisioning Information" and "Policy Information Base")

The acronym, PRC, has evolved from "policy rule class" to "provisioning class." The reason for the change is that a discrepancy existed between the use of the words, "policy rule" in the PRC context versus other uses in PCIM and the industry. In the latter, rules are If/Then statements - a binding of conditions to actions. PRCs are not "rules" by this definition, but the encoding of (network-wide) configuration information for a device.

\$ PProvisioning Instance (PRI)

(T) An instantiation of a PProvisioning Class. [FrameworkPIB] (See also "PProvisioning Class")

\$ QoS

See "Quality of Service."

\$ Quality of Service (QoS)

(A) At a high level of abstraction, "Quality of Service" refers to the ability to deliver network services according to the parameters specified in a Service Level Agreement. "Quality" is characterized by service availability, delay, jitter, throughput and packet loss ratio. At a network resource level, "Quality of Service" refers to a set of capabilities that allow a service provider to prioritize traffic, control bandwidth, and network latency. There are two different approaches to "Quality of Service" on IP networks: Integrated Services [R1633], and Differentiated Service [R2475]. Integrated Services require policy control over the creation of signaled reservations, which provide specific quantitative end-to-end behavior for a (set of) flow(s). In contrast, Differentiated Services require policy to define the correspondence between codepoints in the packet's DS-field and individual per-hop behaviors (to achieve a specified per-domain behavior). A

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

maximum of 64 per-hop behaviors limit the number of classes of service traffic that can be marked at any point in a domain. These classes of service signal the treatment of the packets with respect to various QoS aspects, such as flow priority and packet drop precedence. Policy controls the set of configuration parameters for each class in Differentiated Service, and the admission conditions for reservations in Integrated Services. (See also "policy abstraction" and "Service Level Agreement.")

\$ Resource reSerVation Protocol (RSVP)

(T) A setup protocol designed for an Integrated Services Internet, to reserve network resources for a path. [[R2205](#)] And, a signaling mechanism for managing application traffic's QoS in a Differentiated Service network. [[DCLASS](#)]

\$ role

(P) "Role" is defined from three perspectives:

- A business position or function, to which people and logical entities are assigned [[X.500](#)]
- The labeled endpoints of a UML (Unified Modeling Language) association. Quoting from [[UML](#)], "When a class participates in an association, it has a specific role that it plays in that relationship; a role is just the face the class at the near end of the association presents to the class at the other end of the association." The Policy Core Information Model [[PCIM](#)] uses UML to depict its class hierarchy. Relationships/associations are significant in the model.
- An administratively specified characteristic of a managed element (for example, an interface). It is a selector for policy rules and PProvisioning Classes (PRCs), to determine the applicability of the rule/PRC to a particular managed element. [[PolicyMIB](#), [PCIM](#), [FrameworkPIB](#), [DiffServPIB](#)]

Only the latter definition is directly related to network policy.

\$ role combination

(P) An unordered set of roles that characterize managed elements and indicate the applicability of policy rules and PProvisioning Classes (PRCs). A policy system uses the set of roles reported by the managed element to determine the correct rules/PRCs to be sent for enforcement. That determination may examine all applicable policy rules identified by the role combination, its sub-combinations and the individual roles in the combination

[[PCIM](#)], or may require that PRCs explicitly match the role combination specified for the managed element [FrameworkPIB, DiffServPIB]. The final set of rules/PRCs for enforcement are defined by the policy system, as appropriate for the specified role combination of the managed element.

\$ RSVP

See "Resource reSerVation Protocol."

\$ rule

See "policy rule."

\$ schema

(T) Two different perspectives of schema are defined:

- A set of rules that determines what data can be stored in a database or directory service [[DirServs](#)]
- A collection of data models that are each bound to the same type of repository.

The latter is the preferred and recommended one for ISDs. (See also "data model.")

\$ Security Policy Specification Language (SPSL)

(T) A language designed to express security policies, security domains, and the entities that manage those policies and domains. It supports policies for packet filtering, IP Security (IPsec), and IKE exchanges, but may be extended to express other types of policies. [[SPSL](#)]

\$ service

(P) The behavior or functionality of a network element or host [[DMTF](#), R2216]. Quoting from [RFC 2216](#) [R2216], in order to completely specify a "service", one must define the "functions to be performed . . . , the information required . . . to perform these functions, and the information made available by the element to other elements of the system." Policy can be used to configure a "service" on a network element or host, invoke its functionality, and/or coordinate services in an interdomain or end-to-end environment.

\$ Service Level Agreement (SLA)

(P) The documented result of a negotiation between a

customer/consumer and a provider of a service, that specifies the levels of availability, serviceability, performance, operation or other attributes of the service. (See also "Service Level Objective.")

\$ Service Level Objective (SLO)

(P) Partitions an SLA into individual metrics and operational information to enforce and/or monitor the SLA. "Service Level Objectives" may be defined as part of an SLA, or in a separate document. It is a set of parameters and their values. The actions of enforcing and reporting monitored compliance can be implemented as one or more policies. (See also "Service Level Agreement.")

\$ Service Level Specification (SLS)

(P) Specifies handling of customer's traffic by a network provider. It is negotiated between a customer and the provider, and (for DiffServ) defines a set of parameters (such as

Westerinen, et al. Expires: Nov 2000 + 6 months

[Page 14]

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

specific Code Points and the Per-Hop-Behavior, profile characteristics and treatment of the traffic for those Code Points) and their values. An SLS is a combination of an SLA (a negotiated agreement) and its SLOs (the individual metrics and operational data to enforce). [[DSTERMS](#)] (See also "Service Level Agreement" and "Service Level Objective.")

\$ SLA

See "Service Level Agreement."

\$ SLO

See "Service Level Objective."

\$ SLS

See "Service Level Specification."

\$ SMIV2

See "Structure of Management Information."

\$ SPPI

See "Structure of Policy Provisioning Information."

\$ SPSL

See "Security Policy Specification Language."

\$ Structure of Policy Provisioning Information (SPPI)

(T) An adapted subset of SNMP's Structure of Management Information (SMIv2) that is used to encode collections of related P_Rovisioning Classes as a PIB. [[R2578](#), [SPPI](#)] (See also "Policy Information Base" and "P_Rovisioning Class")

\$ Structure of Management Information, version 2 (SMIv2)

(T) An adapted subset of OSI's Abstract Syntax Notation One, ASN.1 (1988) used to encode collections of related objects as SNMP Management Information Base (MIB) modules. [[R2578](#)]

\$ subject

(P) An entity, or collection of entities, which originates a request, and is verified as authorized/not authorized to perform that request.

\$ target

(P) An entity, or collection of entities, which is affected by a policy. For example, the "targets" of a policy to reconfigure a network device are the individual services that are updated and configured.

[4. Intellectual Property](#)

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in

this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#).

Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

5. Acknowledgements

This document builds on the work of previous terminology drafts. The authors of these drafts were Fran Reichmeyer, Dan Grossman, John Strassner, Ed Ellesson and Matthew Condell. Also, definitions for the general concepts of policy and policy rule include input from Predrag Spasic. Very helpful comments and suggestions were received from Juergen Schoenwaelder and Jon Sapiera.

6. Security Considerations

This document only defines policy-related terms. It does not describe in detail the vulnerabilities of, threats to, or mechanisms that protect specific policy implementations or policy-related Internet protocols.

7. References

[DCLASS] Format of the RSVP DCLASS Object. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-issll-dclass-01.txt](#), Y. Bernet. October 1999.

[DecSupp] Building Effective Decision Support Systems. R. Sprague, and E. Carleson. Prentice Hall, 1982.

[DIAMETER] DIAMETER Framework Document. Internet Draft, [draft-calhoun-diameter-framework-08.txt](#), P. Calhoun, G. Zorn, P. Pan, and H. Akhtar. June 2000.

[DiffPolicy] The DiffServ Policy MIB. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-snmppconf-diffpolicy-02.txt](#), H. Hazewinkel and D. Partain. June 2000.

[DiffServPIB] Differentiated Services Quality of Service Policy Information Base. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-diffserv-pib-01.txt](#), M. Fine, K. McCloughrie, J. Seligson, K. Chan, S. Hahn, A. Smith, and F. Reichmeyer. July 2000.

[DirServs] Understanding and Deploying LDAP Directory Services. T. Howes, M. Smith, and G. Good. MacMillan Technical Publications, 1999.

- [DMTF] Common Information Model (CIM) Schema, version 2.4. Distributed Management Task Force, Inc. August, 2000. The components of the CIM v2.4 schema are available via links on the following DMTF web page:
http://www.dmtf.org/spec/cim_schema_v24.html.
- [DSTERMS] New Terminology for Diffserv. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-diffserv-new-terms-03.txt](#), D. Grossman. November 1999.
- [FrameworkPIB] Framework Policy Information Base. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-rap-frameworkpib-02.txt](#), M. Fine, K. McCloughrie, J. Seligson, K. Chan, S. Hahn, R. Sahita, A. Smith, and F. Reichmeyer. September 2000.
- [IPSP] IP Security Policy (ipsp) Working Group Charter. February 2000. <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/ipsp-charter.html>.
- [PCIM] Policy Core Information Model - Version 1 Specification. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-policy-core-info-model-08.txt](#), B. Moore, E. Ellison, J. Strassner, and A. Westerinen. October 2000.
- [PolicyMIB] Policy Based Management MIB. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-snmplib-pm-03.txt](#), S. Waldbusser, J. Saperia and T. Hongal. October 2000.
- [QoSModel] Policy Framework QoS Information Model. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-policy-qos-info-model-01.txt](#), Y. Snir, Y. Ramberg, J. Strassner, and R. Cohen. April 2000.
- [R1633] Integrated Services in the Internet Architecture: An Overview. R. Braden, D. Clark, and S. Shenker. June 1994.
- [R2026] The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3. S. Bradner. October 1996.
- [R2138] Remote Authentication Dial In User Service (RADIUS). C. Rigney, A. Rubens, W. Simpson, and S. Willens. April 1997.
- [R2205] Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification. R. Braden, L. Zhang, S. Berson, S. Herzog, and S. Jamin. September 1997.

- [R2401] Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol. S. Kent, and R. Atkinson. November 1998.
- [R2409] The Internet Key Exchange (IKE). D. Harkins, and D. Carrel. November 1998.
- [R2474] Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers. K. Nichols, S. Blake, F. Baker, and D. Black. December 1998.
- [R2475] An Architecture for Differentiated Service. S. Blake, D. Black, M. Carlson, E. Davies, Z. Wang, and W. Weiss. December 1998.
- [R2578] Structure of Management Information Version 2 (SMIv2). K. McGloughrie, D. Perkins, J. Schoenwaelder, J. Case, M. Rose, and S. Waldbusser. April 1999.
- [R2702] Requirements for Traffic Engineering Over MPLS. D. Awduche, J. Malcolm, J. Agogbua, M. O'Dell, and J. McManus. September 1999.
- [R2748] The COPS (Common Open Policy Service) Protocol. D. Durham, J. Boyle, R. Cohen, S. Herzog, R. Rajan, and A. Sastry. January 2000.
- [R2753] A Framework for Policy-based Admission Control. R. Yavatkar, D. Pendarakis, and R. Guerin. January 2000.
- [R2828] Internet Security Glossary. R. Shirey. May 2000.
- [SPPI] Structure of Policy Provisioning Information (SPPI). Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-rap-sppi-02.txt](#), K. McCloughrie, M. Fine, J. Seligson, K. Chan, S. Chan, R. Sahita, A. Smith, and F. Reichmeyer. September 2000.
- [SPSL] Security Policy Specification Language. Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-ipsp-spsl-00.txt](#), M. Condell, C. Lynn, and J. Zao. March 2000.
- [UML] The Unified Modeling Language User Guide. G. Booch, J. Rumbaugh, and I. Jacobson. Addison-Wesley, 1999.
- [X.500] Data Communications Networks Directory, Recommendations X.500-X.521, Volume VIII - Fascicle VIII.8. CCITT, IXth Plenary Assembly, Melbourne. November 1988.

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

8. Authors' Addresses

Andrea Westerinen
Cisco Systems, Bldg 20
725 Alder Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
E-mail: andreaw@cisco.com

John Schnizlein
Cisco Systems
9123 Loughran Road
Fort Washington, MD 20744
E-mail: john.schnizlein@cisco.com

John Strassner
Cisco Systems, Bldg 20
725 Alder Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
E-mail: johns@cisco.com

Mark Scherling
Xcert International Inc.
Suite 300
505 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC
V7X 1M3
E-mail: mscherling@xcert.com

Bob Quinn
Celox Networks
One Cabot Road
Hudson, MA 01749
E-mail: bquinn@celoxnetworks.com

Jay Perry
CPlane, Inc.
5150 El Camino Real - B-31
Los Altos, CA 94022
E-mail: jay@cplane.com

Shai Herzog

IPHighway
55 New York Avenue
Framingham, MA 01701
E-mail: herzog@iphighway.com

An-Ni Huynh
Lucent Technologies
2139 Route 35
Holmdel, NJ 07733
E-mail: ahuynh@lucent.com

Westerinen, et al. Expires: Nov 2000 + 6 months

[Page 19]

Internet Draft

Policy Terminology

November 2000

Mark Carlson
Sun Microsystems
2990 Center Green Court South
Boulder, CO 80301
Email: mark.carlson@sun.com

Steve Waldbusser
Email: waldbusser@nextbeacon.com

[9.](#) Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2000). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an

"AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.