P2PSIP diagnostics

draft-ietf-p2psip-diagnostics-09

Presenter: Haibin SONG

Status of the document

- Became WG item years ago…
- Just finished a WGLC
- A few comments were received from Marc
- The authors also have some open questions in mind, need decisions from the meeting

Name of the document

- The existing name is "P2PSIP Overlay Diagnostics"

- Was designed to support "P2PSIP", but not limited to "P2PSIP". It is a RELOAD extension so can be applied to other P2P applications with similar requirements

- The intention is to change the name to "P2P Overlay Diagnostics"

Authorization

- The current draft does not specify a detailed mechanism for access control over the diagnostics info

- WRT self diagnostics purpose after a message was failed, for each kind, a default access control policy must be specified, the value can be "permit" or "deny", suggest to use "permit" as the default value.

- For those kinds with "deny" policy (need authorization), two options forward:
  - 1) each kind based signer: Denote a signer for this kind in the configuration file, any token (limited to this diagnostics kind) signed by this singer (not expired) must be trusted
  - 2) access control list: Sign a list of who can access what, and put the list into the configuration file/overlay

Registry

- Now we have registries for dMFlags, diagnostic extension types, and diagnostic Kind IDs

- The later two can be merged into one registry, the only difference is that diagnostic extension types are used when the "dMFlags" is not enough to indicate the types of diagnostics info to be retrieved, and diagnostics Kind IDs cover all

Dynamic Diagnostics Info

- Make things simple to implement: Bandwidth and Processing power will not be the dynamic available bandwidth or processing power, instead, they represent the access bandwidth from the network service provider and host machine or VM's processing power

- Using 4 bits for congestion status, with 0 represent zero load and all "1"s represent congested. It is not easy to define an accurate algorithm to calculate the value.
  - Leave it to implementations, and clarify that it is just an information value, must not take it as the accurate
  - Unless node is congested, it can handle messages

- Agree?

Next steps

- Update the document to resolve the nits and technical comments

- A new version will be submitted within one month

- More reviews are more than welcome

Thank you!