

SFC Metadata

Thomas Narten

narten@us.ibm.com

SFC WG Interim Meeting

Oct 14, 2016

Interoperability in SFC

- What sort of interoperability can we achieve with SFC?
- draft-ietf-sfc-nsh-10.txt defines format for carrying metadata but does not mandate any particular specific metadata
 - MUST support MD type 1
 - SHOULD support MD type 2
- NSH gives us useful, but rudimentary interop
 - Semantics of metadata unspecified
- Can we do better?

Metadata Documents

- There appears to be interest in publishing metadata definitions
- Documents defining MD type 1
 - draft-guichard-sfc-nsh-dc-allocation-05.txt
 - draft-wang-sfc-nsh-ns-allocation-00.txt
 - draft-meng-sfc-nsh-broadband-allocation-01.txt
 - draft-napper-sfc-nsh-mobility-allocation-00 (expired)
- Documents defining MD type 2
 - draft-browne-sfc-nsh-timestamp-01.txt
 - draft-li-sfc-nsh-multi-domain-00.txt
 - draft-quinn-sfc-nsh-tlv-01.txt

WG Approaches for Metadata

- Document some/all as standards track?
 - What is proper bar for standards track?
 - Current drafts largely appear to need more detail on semantics (syntax is not enough)
 - Surely informational is fine for some
- Document what is being implemented as informational?
 - But if none are standards track, what interoperability do we have?
- Publish “profiles”, collections of specific metadata sets?
 - Goal: interoperability for a given profile

Control/Management Plane

- How do policies (and metadata) get pushed around to SFs?
- What degree of standardization is needed for interoperability?
- Is it sufficient to define the just the metadata objects (ignoring how they are distributed?)
 - Allow multiple management/control planes to push out “standardized” objects?

Discussion/Questions