

Protocol for IPFIX Mediation

draft-ietf-ipfix-mediation-protocol-00

B. Claise, A. Kobayashi, B. Trammell

IETF 83 - Paris - Thursday 29 March 2012

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