Service Function Chaining Working Group Internet-Draft Intended status: Standards Track Expires: September 10, 2015 D. Liu J. Cao Alibaba Group March 9, 2015

Use Case and Requirement of Service Function Chaining Nesting draft-liu-sfc-nesting-use-case-00

Abstract

This document proposes use case and requirement of service function chain.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 10, 2015.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must

Liu & Cao

Expires September 10, 2015

[Page 1]

SFC Nesting

include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Scenario	2
2.	Requirement of Service Function Chain Nesting	4
3.	IANA Considerations	4
4.	Security Considerations	4
5.	Acknowledgements	4
6.	References	4
6.	.1. Normative References	4
6.	.2. Informative References	5
Autł	hors' Addresses	5

1. Scenario

This section discuss a deployment scenario of service function chaining. The scenario discussed in this section is called service function chaining nesting. As shown in figure 1, there are two types of service function chains. The first type is SFC1. There are two sub-type service function chains of SFC1, SFC1_1 and SFC1_2. SFC1_1 and SFC1_2 belongs to the same type of service function chain type SFC1. The second type of service function chain is SFC2. There are two sub-type service function chains of SFC2, namely SFC2_1 and SFC2_2. There are two more types of service function chain of subtype SFC2_1, namely SFC2_1_1 and SFC2_1_2. For service function chain SFC2, there is one sub-type of service function chain called SFC2_2.

The deployment scenario discussed above is an abstraction example of nesting type of service function chain. A more concrete example is as follows:

- o There are two tenants in a public cloud. All of the first tenant's traffic is identified as SFC1 and all of the second tenant's traffic is identified as SFC2. A more concrete example is that the first tenant is social networking service and the second tenant is online gaming service.
- o For the social networking service traffic SFC1, the first sub-type of SFC1 is the traffic between users and it is identified as SFC1_1. The second sub-type of SFC1 is the traffic for advertisement and it is identified as SFC1_2. The traffic of both SFC1_1 and SFC1_2 belong to the same social networking service tenant but it may have different policies. For example, the

Liu & Cao

Expires September 10, 2015

[Page 2]

traffic between users may have higher priority compared with the traffic for advertisement.

- o For the online gaming service SFC2, the first sub-type of SFC2 is the traffic of gaming interaction and it is identified as SFC2_1. There two more sub-type of SFC2_1, the first sub-type is the traffic that belongs to VIP users and it is identified as SFC2_2_1. The other sub-type is the traffic that belongs to normal user and it is identified as SFC2 1 2. Both the traffic of SFC2_1_1 and SFC2_1_2 belong to online gaming interaction traffic but it may have different policy. For example, the traffic of SFC2_1_1 may have higher priority compared with the traffic of SFC2_1_2.
- o The second sub-type of online gaming service is user payment traffic and it is identified as SFC2_2. Both of traffic SFC2_1 and SFC2_2 belong to the online gaming service tenant but it may have different policies. For example, the online gaming interaction traffic may have higher priority compared with the payment traffic.





Expires September 10, 2015

SFC Nesting

2. Requirement of Service Function Chain Nesting

Figure 2 shows the concept of service function chain nesting.



Figure 2: Service Function Chain Nesting Concept

The requirement of service function chain nesting is:

- o The service function chain may have hierarchical structure.
- o One service function chain type may have multiple sub-type of service function chain.
- o One sub-type of service function chain should be identified which upper layer service function chain it belongs to.
- o The number of levels of the hierarchical structure of a service function chain should not be limited.
- 3. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

Note to RFC Editor: this section may be removed on publication as an RFC.

4. Security Considerations

TBD

- 5. Acknowledgements
- 6. References
- 6.1. Normative References
 - [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

Expires September 10, 2015

[Page 4]

6.2. Informative References

[draft-ietf-sfc-architecture-07]
"Service Function Chaining (SFC) Architecture", February
2015.

[draft-ietf-sfc-dc-use-cases] "Service Function Chaining Use Cases In Data Centers", January 2015.

Authors' Addresses

Dapeng Liu Alibaba Group Beijing China

Phone: +86-13911788933 Email: maxpassion@gmail.com

Jie Cao Alibaba Group Hangzhou China