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Overview

- Specifies use of the IPFIX Protocol at an IPFIX Mediator
  - relationship between collected and exported templates
  - export time and timestamp management considerations
  - new IEs for reporting Original Exporter

- Still a work in progress
  - More open questions to address, expect a -01 revision directly after Paris meeting.
Open Issues

- Reference RFC5102bis and/or IANA registry as appropriate (editorial).
- Harmonize with RFC 5101bis template management and section 8-10 changes (editorial).
- Harmonize with RFC 6183 (Framework)/6235 (Anonymization) and -a9n definitions of Intermediate Processes (editorial).
- Questions as to timestamp and observation point handling.
- Questions as to handling of unknown IEs and IE ordering.
Timestamp Handling and Ordering

- What is the relationship between incoming and outgoing Export Times?
  - “the IPFIX Mediator MAY keep the export time received from the incoming Transport Session”
  - “Therefore, as there is not a single rule that fits all different situations, the precise rules of applying the Flow Record timestamps in IPFIX Mediators is out of the scope of this document.”
- Is it necessary to have anything more specific?
- *Proposal*: no, this is sufficient.
Record Ordering

- How does a Mediator handle out-of-order data received at the CP?
  - Proposal: this is application specific
  - Mediators that require (relatively) ordered data (e.g. aggregators) will reorder as a consequence of their ImP anyway
  - Mediators that do not (e.g. anonymizers) MAY but need not
Template IE ordering and unknown IEs

- May a Mediator reorder templates received by its CP when re-exporting (as in §3.2.1)
  - *Proposal*: SHOULD NOT, subject to the function of the ImP.

- What does a Mediator do with unknown fields in templates received by its CP (as in §3.2.1)?
  - *Proposal*: SHOULD forward

- What if one of the unknown fields references the order of the fields in the template (e.g., flowKeyIndicator)?
  - *Proposal*: this is why we forward and don’t reorder. Otherwise, that’s just bad luck, then; note this in draft.

- We need more discussion about guidelines for these and similar situations.
To do

- Handle open issues
- Submit -01 revision after Paris
- List discussion thereon for WGLC before Vancouver