Network Working Group Internet-Draft

Intended status: Informational

Expires: October 15, 2016

J. Schoenwaelder Jacobs University Bremen April 13, 2016

Reclassification of COPS-PR and SPPI to Historic draft-schoenw-opsawg-copspr-historic-04.txt

Abstract

This memo requests the reclassification of RFC 3084, COPS Usage for Policy Provisioning, RFC 3159, Structure of Policy Provisioning Information, RFC 3317, Differentiated Services Quality of Service Policy Information Base, RFC 3318, Framework Policy Information Base, RFC 3571, Framework Policy Information Base for Usage, Feedback, to Historic status.

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 October 15, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to <u>BCP 78</u> 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

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

<u>1</u> .	Introduction	2
<u>2</u> .	Reclassification	2
<u>3</u> .	Security Considerations	3
<u>4</u> .	IANA Considerations	3
<u>5</u> .	References	3
<u>5</u> .	<u>.1</u> . Normative References	3
<u>5</u> .	<u>.2</u> . Informative References	4
Auth	hor's Address	4

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to request and explain the reclassification of the COPS Usage for Policy Provisioning (COPS-PR) [RFC3084] and the Structure of Policy Provisioning Information (SPPI) [RFC3159] along with the Differentiated Services Quality of Service Policy Information Base [RFC3317], the Framework Policy Information Base [RFC3318], and the Framework Policy Information Base for Usage Feedback [RFC3571] to Historic status.

2. Reclassification

The COPS-PR protocol was designed to provision policy information from a Policy Decision Point (PDP) to a Policy Enforcement Point (PEP). The SPPI data modeling language supports COPS-PR by providing a data modeling language for specifying Policy Information Bases (PIBs).

The COPS-PR / SPPI technology has seen limited deployment. The Quality of Service (QoS) provisioning data models created within the IETF [RFC3317], [RFC3318], [RFC3571] did not reach IETF consensus for publication on the standards-track and have since then been Informational documents.

An IAB Network Management Workshop held in 2002 [RFC3535] led to the creation of the XML-based Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) [RFC6241] and an associated data modeling language called YANG [RFC6020]. These new protocols are specifically designed to match the needs of network operators. Configuration management related efforts in the IETF Operations and Management Area are now centered on NETCONF and YANG.

It is therefore appropriate to reclassify COPS-PR and SPPI to Historic status, as described in [RFC2026]. Along with this action,

the QoS provisioning data models written in the SPPI language and published in [RFC3317], [RFC3318], and [RFC3571] are requested to be reclassified to Historic status as well.

3. Security Considerations

Reclassifying RFC 3084, RFC 3159, RFC 3317, RFC 3318, and RFC 3571 has no security implications.

4. IANA Considerations

The IANA rules for registering PIB modules defined in [RFC3159] remain in force.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", <u>BCP 9</u>, <u>RFC 2026</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC2026, October 1996, http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026.
- [RFC3084] Chan, K., Seligson, J., Durham, D., Gai, S., McCloghrie,
 K., Herzog, S., Reichmeyer, F., Yavatkar, R., and A.
 Smith, "COPS Usage for Policy Provisioning (COPS-PR)", RFC
 3084, DOI 10.17487/RFC3084, March 2001,
 http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3084.
- [RFC3159] McCloghrie, K., Fine, M., Seligson, J., Chan, K., Hahn,
 S., Sahita, R., Smith, A., and F. Reichmeyer, "Structure
 of Policy Provisioning Information (SPPI)", RFC 3159, DOI
 10.17487/RFC3159, August 2001,
 http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3159>.
- [RFC3317] Chan, K., Sahita, R., Hahn, S., and K. McCloghrie,
 "Differentiated Services Quality of Service Policy
 Information Base", RFC 3317, DOI 10.17487/RFC3317, March
 2003, http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3317>.
- [RFC3318] Sahita, R., Ed., Hahn, S., Chan, K., and K. McCloghrie,
 "Framework Policy Information Base", RFC 3318, DOI 10
 .17487/RFC3318, March 2003,
 http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3318>.
- [RFC3571] Rawlins, D., Kulkarni, A., Ho Chan, K., Bokaemper, M., and D. Dutt, "Framework Policy Information Base for Usage Feedback", RFC 3571, DOI 10.17487/RFC3571, August 2003, http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3571.

5.2. Informative References

- [RFC3535] Schoenwaelder, J., "Overview of the 2002 IAB Network Management Workshop", <u>RFC 3535</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC3535, May 2003, http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3535>.

Author's Address

Juergen Schoenwaelder Jacobs University Bremen Campus Ring 1 28725 Bremen Germany

Email: j.schoenwaelder@jacobs-university.de