

# Draft Status

draft-gbclt-nvo3-gap-analysis-00

Editor: Eric Gray

Authors: Nabil Bitar, Xiaoming Chen, Marc Lasserre and Tina Tsou

# Initial Draft, but...

- This draft represents the merged efforts of
  - [draft-chen-nvo3-gap-analysis-00](#)
  - [draft-bitar-nvo3-vpn-applicability-01](#)
  - [draft-hy-nvo3-vpn-protocol-gap-analysis-02](#)
- Authors taken from the first two drafts above
  - [Xiaoming Chen](#), [Tina Tsou](#) – Huawei
  - [Nabil Bitar](#) – Verizon
  - [Florin Balus](#) (later replaced by [Marc Lasserre](#)) – Alcatel-Lucent
- Added Eric Gray as Editor
- Acknowledgement extended to all contributors to the earlier drafts
  - [Florin Balus](#), [Luyuan Fang](#), [Sue Hares](#), [Wim Henderickx](#), [Yuichi Ikejiri](#), [Rangaraju Iyengar](#), [Mircea Pisica](#), [Evelyn Roch](#), [Ali Sajassi](#), [Peter Ashwood-Smith](#), [Lucy Yong](#)
- Two internal versions of the merged draft, resulting in this version

# Other Gap Analysis Drafts?

- Two additional GA drafts known to exist
  - <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-dunbar-nvo3-nva-gap-analysis>
    - Orthogonal to our draft, according to Linda Dunbar
    - Probably intended as an FYI to NVO3
  - <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-wu-nvo3-mac-learning-arp>
    - Appears to start a gap analysis based on system discovery requirements not independently established or accepted by the working group

# What's been done so far?

- Started with the format and much of the content of draft-chen-nvo3-gap-analysis
- Updated names, acknowledgements, etc.
- Added control plane requirements currently listed in draft-kreeger-nvo3-overlay-cp-04
- Added control plane requirements currently listed in draft-kreeger-nvo3-hypervisor-nve-cp-01
- Started to build “analysis tables” for control plane requirements
- Added section for Management and Operational Requirements (currently TBD)

# Issues

- Analysis work depends on existing and accepted requirements
  - Progress in parallel with requirements drafts
- Table format needs to provide more information
  - Sometimes Yes/No is enough, not usually
    - Without more than this, it is difficult for readers to have confidence in the (shallow) analysis provided
  - Useful to be able to amplify this with more information
    - May use numbered notes for each table (possibly lettered notes applying to multiple tables)
    - Include RFC numbers where applicable
- Is the set of candidate technologies complete?
- Are any requirements displaced?
- Will need lots of review from the working group
- Summary and conclusions is likely to be the last section completed

# Next Steps

- Adoption by the working group
- Add new analysis as new requirements are accepted by the WG
- Iterate with draft authors of working group adopted requirements drafts to synchronize gap analysis to fit
- Lots of working group review 😊