

# Policies: the Solution to IP Service Management?

**George Pavlou**

**Centre for Communication Systems Research  
School of Electronic Engineering and Information Technology  
University of Surrey, UK**

**[g.pavlou@eim.surrey.ac.uk](mailto:g.pavlou@eim.surrey.ac.uk)**

**<http://www.ee.surrey.ac.uk/Personal/G.Pavlou>**

**NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii**



# Background / Panel Role

Uni**S**

- (Tele)communications management and service engineering background
- Only recently involved in policy-based research
- Trying to assess if policies can lead to flexible, gracefully evolving systems used *together* with conventional approaches
- Will try to represent the puzzled designer / implementor who hears that policy-based management is a panacea but cannot see the why's and how's
- Some views and questions to both the IETF and policy theorists

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii



# Some History

Uni**S**

- **Policy-based management has existed in the research community since the early 90's**
  - **See IM, DSOM, NOMS proceedings**
  
- **Business / service management have been key aspects of the ITU-T TMN model for the management of telecommunication networks**
  - **M.3010 rec: “business management sets goals and targets rather than addressing their achievement; these goals are translated to service and network management actions”**
  
- **With the move to IP-based services it is clear that other management models are needed than SNMP-based device-specific management**
  - **The IP community discovers business/service management in the form of “policy-based networking”**

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii



- **Three-tier architecture**
  - A policy definition layer
  - A policy execution layer where decisions are made and configuration actions are taken
    - Policies are the input from above and network information (events) the input from below
  - A sea of network elements with managed objects
- **Different model to the fixed (but parametrized) layered intelligence of TMN-like hierarchical systems**
- **Flexible model, the intelligence is expressed by policies which are evaluated and implemented**
  - Can this really cover all needed activities, scale, etc.?



# Issues with the Policy Language Approach

Uni**S**

- A policy language is clearly necessary
- But also need for an information model, repository, protocols and architectural framework
  - A language like Ponder should be part of a bigger picture
- Are authorization and obligation the only types of generic policy categorization?
  - Possibly too much influence of a particular problem domain i.e. security and access control
- Network input (events) a nice aspect, totally missing in the IETF approach
- The language approach has been evolving for years but without clear results yet
  - Possibility to influence the IETF approach which has no language but other parts of the picture

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii



# Issues with the IETF Policy Approach

Uni**S**

- **Tries to provide business / service management for IP-based services**
  - IP-based intelligent network, not just bit-pushing
- **From policy definition to enforcement, targets, conditions, actions are needed**
  - no information model
  - no policy language
- **Only policy input to the policy server (or policy execution layer), no network information**
  - cannot support reactive fault and performance management functionality (at least)
- **Can a centralized policy decision point scale in a large domain?**
- **What about inter-domain policy?**

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii



# No Hierarchical Policy Framework

Uni**S**

- **The key missing point is a hierarchical layered policy framework**
  - **High-level declarative policies should consist of more specific lower level policies and so on**
  - **At the lowest layer, policies become configuration requests in network elements**
- **Policy at various levels should apply to managed objects at various levels e.g. element, network, service managed objects**
- **A layered policy framework should result in flexible management systems, able to adapt to evolving requirements without re-engineering**
- **We are looking into this for pro-active and re-active IP QoS management**
  - **The IST TEQUILA project: Traffic Engineering for QUality of service in the Internet at LArge scale**

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii



# Policies for Network Operations in Addition to Policies for SLAs

Uni**S**

- **Policies on network planning and dimensioning**
  - **Example: 50% of my network resources should serve best effort traffic, 40% for various priority classes and 10% for the higher priority class (e.g. expedited traffic)**
- **Policies on dynamic resource management**
  - **If priority traffic cannot be accommodated in the assigned resources, increase them gradually at the expense of best-effort traffic but never go below 20% assigned resources for the latter**
- **Policies on static and dynamic SLS admission control**
- **We are looking at a hierarchical approach for realising such policies**
  - **Policy evaluation / execution at various levels**

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii





# Summary

Uni**S**

- **Policy-based management is a great idea but difficult to design / engineer in a complete fashion**
  - “It’s good, if you can get it...”
- **Many aspects still missing**
  - Hierarchical policy decomposition
  - Complete information model
  - Instrumentation
  - Conflict detection & resolution
- **Could be used together with more conventional management approaches, adding flexibility, supporting graceful evolution, etc.**
- **The fact that IETF is taking a policy approach is encouraging**
  - Can we now hope for a solution after many years of research? 😊

NOMS 2000  
10-14.4.00  
Honolulu  
Hawaii

