



---

# Interoperability Report for ForCES (draft-ietf-forces-interop-02 )

IETF 81 Meeting  
July 25,2011, Quebec City, Canada

---

Weiming Wang, [wmwang@zjgsu.edu.cn](mailto:wmwang@zjgsu.edu.cn)  
Kentaro Ogawa, [ogawa.kentaro@lab.ntt.co.jp](mailto:ogawa.kentaro@lab.ntt.co.jp)  
Evangelos Haleplidis , [ehalep@ece.upatras.gr](mailto:ehalep@ece.upatras.gr)  
Ming Gao , [gmyyqno1@pop.zjgsu.edu.cn](mailto:gmyyqno1@pop.zjgsu.edu.cn)  
Jamal Hadi Salim , [hadi@mojatatu.com](mailto:hadi@mojatatu.com)





# Summary

---

- Current Status
- Key Changes From 01
- Discussion
- Next Step



# Current Status

---

- Version
  - 02
- Update Time
  - 11/7/ 2011



# Key Changes From 01

---

- Removed
  - (b) and (c) in Figure 5
    - which is a test of TML over IPsec between Greece and China/Japan.
      - because the test has not been taken since then.
      - But this does not affect the test that has been successfully taken of TML over IPsec between Japan and China, as shown in Figure 5 (a).
  - Correspondently removed all test items related to Figure 5 (b) and (c) in Figure 9.
- Reorganized some sections
  - Intergrated Section 4.1.1( connection diagram), 4.1.2(design considerations), and 4.1.3(testing process) in 01 version into a whole Section 4.1 (Scenario 1 – LFB Operation) in 02 version.
    - the same for Section 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.
  - Fulfilled Section 10. Security Considerations



## Key Changes From 01 - continued

---

- Some editorial text modifications
  - Corrected a typo of net address from “192.168.50.0/24” to “192.168.60.0/24” in Figure 2
  - Deleted all comments in Figure 8 , 9 and 10
    - The comments are more like short notes taken in the testing process, rather than the test results or comments.
  - Rewrote the text description for Section 5.4 (Packet Forwarding test) and added a comment to this test where is with a failure result
  - Corrected references in Section “11.1 Normative References” and “11.2 Informative References”



# Discussion

---

- Data encoding on table in table
  - A table may have several kinds of data encapsulation formats
    - Sparse data,
    - full data,
    - Or path-data in path-data
    - via a type in the TLV to specify
  - A table in table may have combination numbers of above encap format
    - Decapsulator of the data require all the combination number of ability to decode
  - The question is:
    - Will this combination requirements of decoder reduce the system performance greatly?
    - Do we need to limit the encoding format in some way?



## Next Step

---

- Comments welcomed all the time!
- Ask last call !



Thanks!