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Summary

• My premises:
  • Working group needs to continue doing the sorts of things it has been doing
  • All of these things are outside the current charter which needs to change.

• Need to come up with a proposed charter
  • That says we will continue our current path.
  • That the working group can live with.
  • And that is acceptable to AD and IESG

• Be nice to have some milestones
  • But we also need to make provision for adding them later.

• Need an action plan to go forward with
  • Target dates would be nice
Getting to a Charter Proposal

Current Drafts

• I’ve been circulating a charter draft (Now at iteration Four)
• Also a milestones draft
  • Only one milestone now but we could add some.
• Current Issues (that I know of) to resolve:
  • Chuck’s issue with the virtualization-management text
  • How to address flex-files work.
  • Worries about security area (see Security Issues Slides)
  • Very limited set of milestones (see Milestones)
• I may be missing some issues
Getting to a Charter Proposal

Next Steps

• Need general agreement on broad outlines.
• So speak up ASAP if:
  • You think we need a more restrictive, strictly-maintenance-focused Charter
  • You know of an extension area we are missing
  • There is an important new initiative we should be considering.
  • You think the IESG’s security concerns should be addressed in a different way.
  • You think my draft is significantly wrong in any other way.
• Those not here should also have an opportunity to comment.
• Citing nits is OK, but need to focus on agreement on basic message.
Upward Acceptability

• Have to face the fact that some people have veto power ☹
  • But so far nobody has been brandishing a veto pen ☉
  • We have to make a proposal and see what happens.

• Looking at sections of current proposal:
  • Maintenance section keyed to a lot of the stuff we have been doing, including RFC 7931 and the RDMA bis documents.
  • Extension section should be OK in general given publication of RFC 8178.
  • As far as specific extension areas, including security, we’ll just have to see.
Security Issues

SECDIR Feedback

• Bad feeling of SECDIR about NFS security.
  • Could be an issue when charter is considered by IESG.

• Description of Security Considerations in RFC7530:
  • “Not a security plan.”
  • “Woefully inadequate”
  • “A collection of random thoughts jotted down in a haphazard manner”

• It isn’t a well-thought out plan for NFSv4 security. However,
  • The IESG at the time approved RFC7530 as a Proposed Standard
  • Very similar to Security Considerations in RFCs 3530 and 5661.
Security Issues
Addressing SECDIR Feedback

• Will evolve over time
  • First step is for the charter to *allow* us to address these issues (see Next Slide)

• May need to provide specific security improvements to address existing weaknesses
  • Need more specificity from SECDIR about their concerns.
  • Need general working group agreement on addressing these issues.
  • There are a large number of possible approaches
    • Some possible directions laid out in Possible Security Directions
    • Need to get something acceptable to the working group and SECDIR.
Security Issues
Charter Proposal Responses

• Limited so far:
  • In maintenance section, added a reference to addressing IESG expectations in this area.
    • Not yet sure how to address these expectations
  • Extension section refers to “more effective responses to security challenges”
    • Will need to understand IESG/SECDIR expectations for those extensions.
• Maybe proposing to deal with security challenges (in the abstract) is not OK right now.
  • It would be nice to have at least one concrete proposal for a security-related extension, either from someone in WG or SECDIR.
Possible Security Directions

Slide One of Two

• Explain better where we are and why
  • Respond to the one specific SECDIR criticism.
  • Might not be enough but would help anyway.

• Try to address usage of NFSv4 in non-LAN environments
  • This sounds like it would appeal to SECDIR.
  • We would need SECDIR input regarding current weaknesses.
  • But there might not be sufficient working group or implementer interest.
Possible Security Directions
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• Focus on acceptable performance when encryption is needed
  • Would address MITM attacks without a VPN
  • Would address the problem of NFSv4 being used without privacy, almost universally
  • Since our competition is with disk access protocols, an implementation like that for ISCSI might make sense.
• Would not help performance until adopted by NIC/RNIC vendors
  • Software implementations would serve as prototypes.
  • Would be a very long-term effort
Milestones

• We need to have some to make clear to the IESG where we are going in the near-term.

• Right now only one

• Possible milestone sources:
  • Work arising out of migration-issues-xx.
  • Work for flex-files-xx.
  • RDMA-related milestones?
  • Something security-related?

• We do have the option to add them later.
Arriving at an Action Plan

• Plan needs to address:
  • Who is responsible for what
  • And needs target dates for completion of individual steps

• Needs target dates for:
  • Agreement on broad outlines
  • Agreement on initial set of milestones
  • A proposed draft with any necessary fine-tuning
  • Completion of the process