Draft Status

draft-ietf-nvo3-gap-analysis-01

Editor: Eric Gray

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

Second WG Draft

- Trying to address concerns about Control Plane analysis
  - **Need to provide one or more examples**
  - **Need input from the WG**
  - Had drafts on LISP tried using this as an example draft-hertoghs-nvo3-lisp-controlplane-unified
- Authors pushed back on including this ***as an example*** in the draft
  - If included in a posted WG draft as the only ***example*** this might be used by some as an indication that this represented WG consensus at this point
  - This could be providing a back-door entrance to a solutions draft
  - Challenge is to get other examples of existing protocols and how they would be used to address control plane requirements
- Proposed a high-level change to Control Plane Analysis
  - Divide analysis for each section into L3 and L2 applicable solutions
- Current version includes this change
  - No specific examples are included in the posted draft

LISP based Example 5.1 (3.1)

Supported Approach	NVGRE	VxLAN	VPLS	EVPN	L3
Control Protocol Mapping Acquisition?	(B)	(B)		(A)	
- - - Data-Plane Learning?	- - -	- - -	- - -	- -	-

Table 1: Inner:Outer Address Mapping

(A) See [I-D.hertoghs-nvo3-lisp-controlplane-unified], section

(B) See [I-D.hertoghs-nvo3-lisp-controlplane-unified], section use of LISP for control-plane learning of MAC address mapping information for L2 VN services (VXLAN/NVGRE) is considered (in referenced document) to be sub-optimal.

LISP based Example 5.1 (3.3)

Requirement	NVGRE	VxLAN	VPLS	EVPN	L3V
Connect Notification				(A)	(A
- - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- -	- -
Disconnect Notification				(A)	(A

Table 3: Connect/Disconnect Notification

(A) See [I-D.hertoghs-nvo3-lisp-controlplane-unified], section
The LISP control plane can take advantage of presumed network a
detach functions or the discovery of new MAC/IP addresses to tr
registration/de-registration of Tenant Systems to the Mapping S

Other Gap Analysis Drafts?

- Additional GA draft known to exist
  - http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-dunbar-nvo3-nva-gap-analysis
    - Does not explicitly identify ***what*** requirements are used in analysis
    - Significant focus is on push/pull
    - Possibly ***not*** intended as an FYI to NVO3
  - Listed on the WG charter page as a ***related*** draft

Issues

- Analysis work depends on existing and accepted requirements
  - Progress in parallel with requirements drafts is currently slow across the board
- Table format will provide more information
  - Dividing tables to separate L2 and L3 will allow more content in table cells (see examples to see how crowded it is otherwise)
  - Hope to use table footnotes
    - Use notes for each table (possibly numbered notes applying to multiple tables)
    - Include draft names and RFC numbers where applicable
- Is the set of candidate technologies complete/closed?
- Will need lots of review from the working group
- Summary and conclusions will be the last section completed
- What to do about ***TBD*** analysis sections
  - The previous ***Operational Requirements*** is now ***OAM requirements***
    - should the corresponding section be renamed?
    - will there still be an operational requirements draft?

Next Steps

- Reviews by the working group
- Update analysis as requirements are updated in WG drafts
- Iterate with draft authors of working group adopted requirements drafts to synchronize gap analysis to fit
- Lots more working group review ☺