

TEAS Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Informational

Expires September 1, 2018.

Young Lee (Editor)
Huawei

Daniele Ceccarelli
Ericsson

Takuya Miyasaka
KDDI

Jong Yoon Shin
SKT

Kwang-koog Lee
KT

March 1, 2018

Requirements for Abstraction and Control of TE Networks

[draft-ietf-teas-actn-requirements-09](#)

Abstract

This document provides a set of functional requirements for abstraction and control of Traffic Engineering networks to facilitate virtual network operation via the creation of a single virtualized network or a seamless service. This supports operators in viewing and controlling different domains (at any dimension: applied technology, administrative zones, or vendor-specific technology islands) as a single virtualized network.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

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/1id-abstracts.txt>

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 1, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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 described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1.	Requirements Language.....	4
2.	High-level ACTN requirements.....	4
2.1.	Service-Specific Requirements.....	5
2.2.	Network-Related Requirements.....	7
3.	Security Considerations.....	9
4.	IANA Considerations.....	9
5.	References.....	10
5.1.	Normative References.....	10
5.2.	Informative References.....	10
6.	Contributors.....	11
	Authors' Addresses.....	12

1. Introduction

This document provides a set of functional requirements for Abstraction and Control of Traffic Engineering (TE) Networks (ACTN) identified in various use-cases specified by the operators. [ACTN-Frame] defines the base reference architecture and terminology.

ACTN refers to the set of virtual network service operations needed to coordinate, control and manage large-scale multi-domain TE networks so as to facilitate network programmability, automation, efficient resource sharing, and end-to-end virtual service aware connectivity.

These operations are summarized as follows:

- Abstraction and coordination of underlying network resources independent of how these resources are managed or controlled, so that higher-layer entities can dynamically control virtual networks based on those resources. Control includes creating, modifying, monitoring, and deleting virtual networks.
- Collation of the identifiers and other attributes of the resources from multiple TE networks (multiple technologies, equipment from multiple vendors, under the control of multiple administrations) through a process of recursive abstraction to present a customer with a single virtual network. This is achieved by presenting the network domain as an abstracted topology to the customer via open and programmable interfaces. Recursive abstraction allows for the recursion of abstracted data in a hierarchy of controllers.. It is expected that the recursion levels should be at least three levels: customer level, multi-domain network level, and domain network level.
- Coordination of end-to-end virtual network services and applications via allocation of network resources to meet specific service, application and customer requirements. Refer to [ACTN-Frame] for the definition of coordination.
- Adaptation of customer requests (to control virtual resources) to the physical network resources performing the necessary mapping, translation, isolation and, policy that allows conveying, managing and enforcing customer policies with respect to the services and the network of the customer.

- Provision via a data model and virtual control capability to customers who request virtual network services. Note that these customers could, themselves, be service providers.

ACTN solutions will build on, and extend, existing TE constructs and TE mechanisms wherever possible and appropriate. Support for controller-based approaches is specifically included in the possible solution set.

1.1. Requirements Language

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.

2. High-level ACTN requirements

This section provides a summary of use-cases in terms of two categories: (i) service-specific requirements; (ii) network-related requirements. All these requirements are specified by operators that are interested in implementing ACTN.

Service-specific requirements listed below are uniquely applied to the work scope of ACTN. Service-specific requirements are related to the virtual service coordination function. These requirements are related to customer's Virtual Networks (VN) in terms of service policy associated with VNs such as service performance objectives, VN endpoint location information for certain required service specific functions (e.g., security and others), VN survivability requirement, or dynamic service control policy, etc.

Network-related requirements are related to and necessary for coherent/seamless for the virtual network operation function. These requirements are related to multi-domain and multi-layer signaling, routing, protection/restoration and re-optimization/re-grooming, etc.

Each requirement specified in Sections [2.1](#) and [2.2](#) is derived from ACTN use-cases: [[CHENG](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[FANG](#)], [[KLEE](#)], [[KUMAKI](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[SHIN](#)], [[XU](#)], [[XU2](#)], and [[SUZUKI](#)].

2.1. Service-Specific Requirements

1. Requirement 1: Virtual Network Service (VNS) creation

Customer MUST be able to request/instantiate the VNS to the network within the confines of mutual agreement between customer and network operator and network operator's capability. A VNS is the service agreement between a customer and provider to provide a VN [ACTN-Frame]. There are different types of VNS in terms of the VN types the customer is allowed to operate (e.g., a VN type can be simply a set of edge-to-edge links, or it can comprise of virtual nodes and virtual links, etc.). The customer MUST be able to express VNS preference that captures Service Level Agreements (SLA) associated with virtual network service (e.g., Endpoint selection preference, routing preference, time-related preference, etc.)

Reference: [[KLEE](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[SHIN](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[FANG](#)].

2. Requirement 2: Virtual Network Service Query

Customer SHOULD be able to request VNS Query ("Can you give me these VN(s)?") that include the following parameters:

- VN type: various VN types defined by the customer (e.g., path, graph, etc.)
- VN end-points (Customer Edge interface information)
- VN Topology Service-specific Objective Functions (e.g., a set of objective functions as defined in [[RFC5541](#)] to be supported on the paths, but not limited to).
- VN constraints requirement (e.g., Maximum Latency threshold, Minimum Bandwidth, etc.)

Reference: [[KUMAKI](#)], [[FANG](#)], [[CHENG](#)].

3. Requirement 3: VNS Instantiation ("Please create a VNS for me")

Customer MUST be able to instantiate VNS that includes various VNS related parameters:

- VN type: various VN types defined by the customer (e.g., Type 1, Type 2, etc. See [ACTN-Frame] for the definition of VN Type 1 and Type 2).
- VN end-points (Customer Edge interface information)
- VN Topology Service-specific Objective Functions (e.g., a set of objective functions as defined in [RFC5541] to be supported on the paths, but not limited to).
- VN constraints requirement (e.g., Maximum Latency threshold, Minimum Bandwidth, etc.)
- VN Topology diversity when there are multiple instances of VNS (e.g., VN1 and VN2 must be disjoint; Node/link disjoint from other VNS)

Note that Requirement 3 provides specific details of Requirement 1.

Reference: [KUMAKI], [FANG], [CHENG].

4. Requirement 4: VNS Lifecycle Management & Operation (M&O)

Customer MUST be able to perform the following VNS operations:

- VNS Delete: Customer MUST be able to delete VNS.
- VNS Modify: Customer MUST be able to modify VNS related parameters during the lifecycle of the instantiated VNS.

Reference: [FANG], [KUMAKI], [LOPEZ], [DHODY], [FANG], [KLEE].

5. Requirement 5: VNS Isolation

Customer's VN should be able to use arbitrary network topology, routing, or forwarding functions as well as customized control mechanisms independent of the underlying physical network and of other coexisting virtual networks. Other customers' VNS operation MUST NOT impact a particular customer's VNS network operation.

Reference: [KUMAKI], [FANG], [LOPEZ]

6. Requirement 6: Multi-Destination Coordination

Customer MUST be able to define and convey service/preference requirements for multi-destination applications (e.g., set of candidate sources/destinations, thresholds for load balancing, disaster recovery preference, etc.)

Reference: [[FANG](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[SHIN](#)].

7. Requirement 7: VNS Performance Monitoring

The customer MUST be able to define performance monitoring parameters and its associated preference such as frequency of report, abstraction/aggregation level of performance data (e.g., VN level, tunnel level, etc.) with dynamic feedback loop from the network.

Reference: [[XU](#)], [[XU2](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[CHENG](#)]

8. Requirement 8: VNS Confidentiality and Security Requirements

The following confidentiality/security requirements MUST be supported in all interfaces:

- Securing the request and control of resources, confidentiality of the information, and availability of function.
- Trust domain verification between a customer entity and a network entity. It verifies if a trust relationship has been established between these entities.
- Encrypting data that flow between components, especially when they are implemented at remote nodes, regardless if these are external or internal network interfaces.

Reference: [[KUMAKI](#)], [[FANG](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)]

2.2. Network-Related Requirements

1. Requirement 1: Virtual Network Service Coordination

Network MUST be able to support the following VNS operations:

- VNS Create: Upon customer's VNS creation request, network MUST be able to create VNS within the confines of network resource availability.
- VNS Delete: Upon customer's VNS deletion request, network MUST be able to delete VNS.
- VNS Modify: Upon customer's VNS modification request, network MUST be able to modify VNS related parameters during the lifecycle of the instantiated VNS.
- VNS Monitor: Upon customer's VNS performance monitoring setup, the network MUST be able to support VNS level Operations, Administration and Management (OAM) Monitoring under service agreement.

Reference: [[FANG](#)], [[KUMAKI](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[FANG](#)], [[KLEE](#)].

2. Requirement 2: Topology Abstraction Capability

The network MUST be capable of managing its networks based on the principle of topology abstraction to be able to scale multi-layer, multi-domain networks.

Reference: [[KLEE](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[CHENG](#)].

3. Requirement 3: Multi-Domain & Multi-layer Coordination

Network coordination for multi-domain and multi-layer path computation and path setup operation MUST be provided:

- End-to-end path computation across multi-domain networks (based on abstract topology from each domain)
- Domain sequence determination
- Request for path signaling to each domain controller
- Alternative TE path computation if any of the domain controllers cannot find its domain path

Reference: [[CHENG](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[KLEE](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[SHIN](#)], [[SUZUKI](#)].

4. Requirement 4: End-to-End Path Protection

End-to-end Path Protection Operations MUST be provided with seamless coordination between domain-level protection schemes and cross-domain protection schemes.

Reference: [[CHENG](#)], [[KLEE](#)], [[DHODY](#)], [[LOPEZ](#)], [[SHIN](#)].

5. Requirement 5: Dynamicity of virtual network control operations

Dynamic virtual network control operations MUST be supported. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Real-time VNS control (e.g., fast recovery/reroute upon network failure).
- Fast convergence of abstracted topologies upon changes due to failure or reconfiguration across the network domain view, the multi-domain network view and the customer view.
- Large-scale VNS operation (e.g., the ability to process tens of thousands of connectivity requests) for time-sensitive applications.

Reference: [[SHIN](#)], [[XU](#)], [[XU2](#)], [[KLEE](#)], [[KUMAKI](#)], [[SUZUKI](#)].

3. Security Considerations

The ACTN requirements described in this document do not directly bear specific security concerns. When these requirements are implemented in specific interfaces, securing the request and control of resources, confidentiality of the information, and availability of function, should all be critical security considerations.

4. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

- [ACTN-Frame] D. Ceccarelli, et al., "Framework for Abstraction and Control of Transport Networks", [draft-ietf-teas-actn-framework](#), work in progress.

5.2. Informative References

- [RFC2119] S. Bradner, "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC5541] JL. Le Roux, JP. Vasseur, and Y. Lee, "Encoding of Objective Functions in the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5541](#), June 2009.
- [RFC8174] B. Leiba, "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [RFC 8174](#), May 2017.
- [CHENG] W. Cheng, et. al., "ACTN Use-cases for Packet Transport Networks in Mobile Backhaul Networks", [draft-cheng-actn-ptn-requirements-00](#), July 21, 2014.
- [DHODY] D. Dhody, et. al., "Packet Optical Integration (POI) Use Cases for Abstraction and Control of Transport Networks (ACTN)", [draft-dhody-actn-poi-use-case-07](#), October 28, 2016.
- [FANG] L. Fang, "ACTN Use Case for Multi-domain Data Center Interconnect", [draft-fang-actn-multidomain-dci-01](#), September 29, 2014.
- [KLEE] K. Lee, H. Lee, R. Vilata, V. Lopez, "ACTN Use-case for E2E Network Services in Multiple Vendor Domain Transport Networks", [draft-lee-teas-actn-connectivity-multi-domain-03](#), July 31, 2017.
- [KUMAKI] K. Kumaki, T. Miyasaka, "ACTN : Use case for Multi Tenant VNO", [draft-kumaki-teas-actn-multitenant-vno-00](#), May 29, 2014.
- [LOPEZ] D. Lopez (Ed), "ACTN Use-case for Virtual Network Operation for Multiple Domains in a Single Operator Network", [draft-lopez-actn-vno-multidomains-01](#), October 27, 2014.

- [SHIN] J. Shin, R. Hwang, J. Lee, "ACTN Use-case for Mobile Virtual Network Operation for Multiple Domains in a Single Operator Network", [draft-shin-actn-mvno-multi-domain-00](#), June 30, 2014.
- [XU] Y. Xu, et. al., "Use Cases and Requirements of Dynamic Service Control based on Performance Monitoring in ACTN Architecture", [draft-xu-actn-perf-dynamic-service-control-03](#), April 23, 2015.
- [XU2] Y. Xu, et. al., "Requirements of Abstract Alarm Report in ACTN architecture", [draft-xu-teas-actn-abstract-alarm-report-00](#), July 6, 2015.
- [SUZUKI] T. Suzuki, et. al., "Use-case and Requirements for Multi-domain Operation Plane Change", [draft-suzuki-teas-actn-multidomain-opc-00](#), July 6, 2015.

6. Contributors

Dhruv Dhody
Huawei Technologies
Email: dhruv.ietf@gmail.com

Sergio Belotti
Nokia
Via Trento, 30
Vimercate, Italy
Email: sergio.belotti@nokia.com

Khuzema Pithewan
Peloton Technology
Email: khuzemap@gmail.com

Yunbin Xu
CATR
Email: xuyunbin@ritt.cn

Toshiaki Suzuki
Hitachi

Email: toshiaki.suzuki.cs@hitachi.com

Haomian Zheng

Huawei

Email: zhenghaomian@huawei.com

Authors' Addresses

Young Lee (Editor)

Huawei Technologies

5340 Legacy Drive

Plano, TX 75023, USA

Phone: (469)277-5838

Email: leeyoung@huawei.com

Daniele Ceccarelli

Ericsson

Torshamnsgatan, 48

Stockholm, Sweden

Email: daniele.ceccarelli@ericsson.com

Takuya Miyasaka

KDDI

Email: ta-miyasaka@kddi.com

Jong Yoon Shin

SKT

Email: jongyoon.shin@sk.com

Kwang-koog Lee

KT

Email: kwangkoog.lee@kt.com