

# LoLa & ACME STAR

Thomas Fossati, Diego De Aguilar Cañellas  
(Nokia, TID, MAMI Project)

# Latency-Loss Tradeoff (LLT)

[\[Docs\]](#) [\[txt|pdf\]](#) [\[Tracker\]](#) [\[Email\]](#) [\[Nits\]](#)

Versions: [00](#)

Tsvwg Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 14, 2016

J. You  
Huawei  
M. Welzl  
University of Oslo  
B. Trammell  
M. Kuehlewind  
ETH Zurich  
K. Smith  
Vodafone Group  
March 13, 2016

**Latency Loss Tradeoff PHB Group**  
**draft-you-tsvwg-latency-loss-tradeoff-00**

## Abstract

This document defines a PHB (Per-Hop Behavior) group called Latency Loss Tradeoff (LLT). The LLT group is intended to provide delivery of IP packets in two classes of services: a low-loss service (Lo service) and a low-latency service (La service). The LLT group enables an application to request treatment for either low-loss or low-latency at a congested network link.

# DiffServ made simple

- LLT is a DiffServ (RFC 2475) marking scheme that provides a radical simplification of the DiffServ model
- Traffic belongs to one of two classes:
  - loss-sensitive (Lo), or
  - latency-sensitive (La)
- That's it: mark your traffic appropriately and let the network do the right thing

# Explicit cooperation from endpoints

- The difficult part is convincing applications that marking their (encrypted) packets appropriately provides an advantage to them
- The main reason why we are doing this is to create the experiments that allow us to understand whether this mechanism actually works in practice
- (And resume a conversation that was interrupted after the MarNEW workshop and the ACCORD BoF.)

# Saturday

- We have the flow mix and queueing already in place
- So the focus at this round was on data analysis:
  - Run a flow mix through the queues, take raw packet captures at various places, correlate them when needed, visualise interesting stats
  - In particular, queueing latency and drop patterns in relation to the flow mix
- In practice a couple hundred lines of tshark, Awk and R (the latter was a first for me and I have enjoyed it a lot)

# ACME STAR

[[Docs](#)] [[txt](#)|[pdf](#)|[xml](#)|[html](#)] [[Tracker](#)] [[WG](#)] [[Email](#)] [[Diff1](#)] [[Diff2](#)] [[Nits](#)]

Versions: ([draft-sheffer-acme-star](#)) [00](#)

ACME Working Group

Internet-Draft

Intended status: Standards Track

Expires: December 18, 2017

Y. Sheffer

Intuit

D. Lopez

O. Gonzalez de Dios

A. Pastor Perales

Telefonica I+D

T. Fossati

Nokia

June 16, 2017

Use of Short-Term, Automatically-Renewed (STAR) Certificates to Delegate  
Authority over Web Sites

[draft-ietf-acme-star-00](#)

## Abstract

This memo proposes an ACME extension to enable the issuance of short-term and automatically renewed certificates. This allows a domain name owner to delegate the use of certificates to another party, while retaining the capability to cancel this delegation at any time with no need to rely on certificate revocation mechanisms.

# Automate certificate renewal

- Extension to the ACME protocol to automate certificate renewal
- A generally useful extension, that we'd like to use in combination with draft-sheffer-acme-star-request to allow a CDN / Cloud service to obtain certificates for HTTPS delivery bearing the content provider name

# Sunday

- Diego has worked (remotely) on the ACME STAR code extending Boulder and Certbot, while I did the STAR LURK bits from scratch.
- There are still some moving parts (especially on my side), but we have enough beef to start integrating the two parts in an end-to-end demo that comprises a portable mini-CDN with DNS based redirection and HTTPS delivery
- This work has just started, will try to have the setup complete by IETF 100