Ethernet Proxying Support for HTTP

draft-ietf-masque-connect-ethernet-04

Alejandro Sedeño

Closed Issues

Noted in performance considerations:

- MTU and Fragmentation
- Concerns around frame delivery order
- Special considerations for VLANs

Future extensions:

- MAC Address filtering

Closed Issues

Out of scope / Delegated:

- Special considerations for Ethernet PAUSE frames

Closed without action:

- Use by E-VPN: encourage or discourage?

Open Issues

- VLAN Tagging (#15) / Client Configuration (#16)
- Supported Ethernet Version(s) (#19)
- Layer separation when determining what is congestion controlled (#18)

VLAN Tagging (#15) / Client Configuration (#16)

In the draft, we RECOMMEND that VLANs be proxies over separate connections rather than proxying Ethernet frames with VLAN tags over a single connection, but do not describe how such connections would be differentiated. We also stripped the URI template language from CONNECT-IP because we had no template parameters to specify.

Suggested changes: restore the URI-template language sans parameters by default, and also have a named network example.

Named networks, not VLAN tags: decouples tags across bridged segments.

Supported Ethernet Version(s) (#19)

There are no normative references to a specific supported Ethernet version or versions. e.g., 802.1Q (VLANs) support. The description, ***The Context ID zero (0) payload is a full Layer 2 Ethernet Frame (from the MAC destination field until the last byte of the Frame check sequence field)*** is poorly defined.

Suggested changes: the protocol itself should not care about what version of Ethernet frames it carries so long as the endpoints agree. If there is a need for it, this draft or a future extension could describe some form of negotiation.

If we need to, we can specify Ethernet II (IEEE 802.3) frames.

Layer separation when determining what is congestion controlled (#18)

Do we want to discuss potential layer violations an Ethernet proxying endpoint might use to determine if a proxied flow is congestion controlled?

Suggested changes: This should not be part of the protocol itself, but perhaps we should add an appendix containing possible techniques an endpoint might use. It should not be too detailed, and should be clearly marked optional.

PRs welcome.

Questions?

Ethernet Proxying Support for HTTP

draft-ietf-masque-connect-ethernet-04