

IPFIX Implementation Guidelines

Elisa Boschi

Lutz Mark

Jürgen Quittek

Martin Stiemerling

Paul Aitken

Hitachi Europe

Fraunhofer FOKUS

NEC Europe

NEC Europe

Cisco Systems

Status

- ▶ Gone through IETF and IESG review
 - Comments received from transport area and gen area directorates
- ▶ Two DISCUSSEs filed
- ▶ New version produced addressing all the comments available at
<http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~nevil/ipfix/draft-ietf-ipfix-implementation-guidelines-08.txt>

New paragraph in SCTP section

- ▶ One paragraph added as agreed in Chicago and as specified in draft-trammell-sctp-change-01:

... an Exporting Process sending Template Withdrawal Messages should ensure to the extent possible that the Template Withdrawal Messages and subsequent Template Sets reusing the withdrawn Template IDs are received and processed at the Collecting Process in proper order.

Transport directorate review: the use of UDP is NOT RECOMMENDED

- ▶ SOLUTION:
- ▶ Added text in the UDP section to discourage the use of UDP unless limited to very special cases

Gen-art review: use of RFC2119 language

- ▶ Filed as DISCUSS n. 1:
 - The use of RFC2119 language in guidelines documents is considered dangerous
- ▶ SOLUTION
 - Inserted text stating that :

„This document is Informational. It does not specify a protocol and does not use RFC 2119 keywords [RFC2119] such as "MUST" and "SHOULD", except in quotations and restatements from the IPFIX standards documents. The normative specification of the protocol is given in the IPFIX Protocol and Information Model documents.“
 - All MAYs, MUSTSs and SHOULDs in the document are restatement of the protocol (with reference)

IESG Chat → DISCUSS n. 2

- ▶ Problems with a paragraph on SCTP „maturity“ considerations
- ▶ SOLUTION
- ▶ Paragraph removed
 - Not applicable anymore
 - Confusing rather than useful

Other changes

- ▶ Section 1.1 „History of IPFIX“ removed
- ▶ Editorial changes
- ▶ Nits
- ▶ ...