Abstract

The IETF has produced a considerable number of data models in the YANG modelling language. The majority of these are used to model devices and they allow access for configuration and to read operational status.

A small number of YANG models are used to model services (for example, the Layer Three Virtual Private Network Service Model produced by the L3SM working group).

This document briefly sets out the scope of and purpose of an IETF service model, and it shows where a service model might fit into a Software Defined Networking architecture or deployment.
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1. Introduction

In recent years the number of data models written in the YANG modelling language [RFC6020] for configuration and monitoring has blossomed. Many of these are used for device-level configuration (for example, [RFC7223]) or for control of protocols (for example, [RFC7407]).

Within the context of Software Defined Networking (SDN) [RFC7426] YANG data models may be used on Southbound Interfaces (SBIs) between a controller and network devices, and between network orchestrators and controllers. There may also be a hierarchy of such components...
with super-controllers, domain controllers, and device controllers all exchanging information and instructions using YANG models.

Recently there has been interest in using YANG to define and document data models that describe services in a portable way that is independent of which network operator uses the model. These models may be used in manual and even paper-driven service request processes moving to IT-based mechanisms. Ultimately they could be used in online, software-driven dynamic systems.

This document explains the scope and purpose of service models within the IETF and describes how a service model can be used by a network operator. Equally, this document clarifies what a service model is not, and dispels some common misconceptions.

Other work on classifying YANG data models has been done in [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification]. That document provides an important reference for this document, and also uses the term "service model". Section 6.1 provides a comparison between these two classifications.

2. Terms and Concepts

Readers should familiarize themselves with the description and classification of YANG models provided in [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification].

The following terms are used in this document:

Network Operator: This term is used interchangeably to refer to the company that owns a network that provides Internet connectivity and services, or the individual who performs operations and management on that network.

Customer: Someone who purchases connectivity and other services from a network operator. In the context of this document, a customer is usually the company that runs their own network or computing platforms and wishes to connect to the Internet or between sites. Such a customer may operate an enterprise network or a data center. Sometimes this term may also be used to refer to the individual in such a company who contracts to buy services from a network operator. A customer as described here is a separate commercial operation from the network operator, but some companies may operate with internal customers so that, for example, an IP/MPLS packet network is the customer of an optical transport network.
Service: A network operator delivers one or more services to a customer. A service in the context of this document (sometimes called a Network Service) is some form of connectivity between customer sites and the Internet or between customer sites across the network operator’s network and across the Internet.

A service may be limited to simple connectivity (such as IP-based Internet access), may be a tunnel (such as a virtual circuit), or may be a more complex connectivity model (such as a multi-site virtual private network). Services may be further enhanced by additional functions providing security, load-balancing, accounting, and so forth. Additionally, services usually include guarantees of quality, throughput, and fault reporting.

This document makes a distinction between a service as delivered to a customer (that is, the service as discussed on the interface between a customer and the network operator) and the service as realized within the network (as described in [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification]. This distinction is discussed further in Section 6.

Data Model: The concepts of information models and data models are described in [RFC3444]. That document defines a data model by contrasting it with the definition of an information model, so it may be helpful to quote some text to give context within this document.

The main purpose of an information model is to model managed objects at a conceptual level, independent of any specific implementations or protocols used to transport the data. The degree of specificity (or detail) of the abstractions defined in the information model depends on the modeling needs of its designers. In order to make the overall design as clear as possible, an information model should hide all protocol and implementation details. Another important characteristic of an information model is that it defines relationships between managed objects.

Data models, conversely, are defined at a lower level of abstraction and include many details. They are intended for implementors and include protocol-specific constructs.

Service Model: A service model is a specific type of data model. It describes a service and all of the parameters of the service in a portable way. The service model may divided into to categories:
Customer Service Model: A customer service model is used to describe a service as offered or delivered to a customer by a network operator. It can be used by a human or by software to configure or request a service and may equally be consumed by a human or by a software component. Such models are sometimes referred to simply as "service models" [I-D.ietf-l3sm-l3vpn-service-model].

Service Delivery Model: A service delivery model is used by a network operator to define and configure how a service is provided by the network. It can be used by a human operator or by a software tool to instruct network components. Such models are sometimes referred to as "network service models" [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification].

The distinction between a customer service model and a service delivery model needs to be repeatedly clarified. A customer service model is not a data model used to directly configure network devices, protocols, or functions: it is not something that is sent to network devices (i.e., routers or switches) for processing. Equally, a customer service model is not a data model that describes how a network operator realizes and delivers the service described by the model. This issue is discussed further in later sections.

3. Using Service Models

As already indicated, customer service models are used on the interface between customers and network operators. This is shown simply in Figure 1

The language in which a customer service model is described is a choice for whoever specifies the model. The IETF uses the YANG data modeling language defined in [RFC6020]

The encoding and communication protocol used to exchange a customer service model between customer and network operator are deployment- and implementation-specific. The IETF recommends the use of the NETCONF Configuration Protocol [RFC6241] or the RESTCONF protocol [I-D.ietf-netconf-restconf] with data encoded in XML or JSON for interactions "on the wire" between software components. However, co-located software components might use an API, while systems with more direct human interactions might use web pages or even paper forms.
How a network operator processes a customer’s service request described with a customer service model will depend on the commercial and operational tools, processes, and policies used by the operator. These may vary considerably from one network operator to another.

However, the intent is that the network operator maps the service request into configuration and operational parameters that control one or more network to deliver the requested services. That means that the network operator (or software run by the network operator) takes the information in the customer service model and determines how to deliver the service by enabling and configuring network protocols and devices. They may achieve this by constructing service delivery models and passing them southbound to network orchestrators or controllers.

4. Service Models in an SDN Context

In an SDN system, the control and configuration of network resources and protocols is performed by software systems that determine how best to utilize the network. Figure 2 shows a common architectural view of an SDN system where network elements are programmed by a component called a controller, and where controllers are instructed by an orchestrator that has a wider view of the whole of, or part of, a network.

Figure 1: The Customer Service Models used on the Interface between Customers and Network Operators
But a customer’s service request is (or should be) network-agnostic. That is, there should be an independence between the behavior and functions that a customer requests and the technology that the network operator has available to deliver the service. This means that the service request must be mapped to the orchestrator’s view, and this mapping may include a choice of which networks to use depending on what technologies are available and which service features have been requested.

This mapping can be achieved by splitting the orchestration function between a "Service Orchestrator" and a "Network Orchestrator" as shown in Figure 3. In a system that is fully implemented in software, this could lead to agile service delivery or service automation.
Figure 3: An SDN Architecture with a Service Orchestrator

Figure 3 also shows where different data models might be applied within the architecture.

The split between control components that exposes a "service interface" is present in many figures showing extended SDN architectures:
Figure 1 of [RFC7426] shows a separation of the "Application Plane", the "Network Services Abstraction Layer (NSAL)", and the "Control Plane". It marks the "Service Interface" as situated between the NSAL and the Control Plane.

[RFC7491] describes an interface between an "Application Service Coordinator" and an "Application-Based Network Operations Controller".

Figure 1 of [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification] shows an interface from an Operations Support System (OSS) or a Business Support System (BSS) that is expressed in "service models".

This can all lead to some confusion around the definition of a "service interface" and a "service model". Some previous literature considers the interface that is northbound of the Network Orchestrator to be a "service interface" used by an application (as shown in Figure 3), but the service described at this interface is network-centric and is aware of many features such as topology, technology, and operator policy. Thus, we make a distinction between this type of service interface and the more abstract service interface where the service is described by a service model and the interaction is between customer and operator. Further discussion of this point is provided in Section 5.

5. Possible Causes of Confusion

In discussing service models, there are several possible causes of confusion:

- The services we are discussing are services provided by network operators to customers. This is a completely different thing to "Foo as a Service" (for example, Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)) where a service provider offers a service at some location that is reached across a network. The confusion arises not only because of the use of the word "service", but also because network operators may offer value-added services as well as network connection services to their customers.

- Network operation is completely out of scope in the discussion of services between a network operator and a customer. That means that the customer service model does not reveal to the customer anything about how the network operator delivers the service. The model does not expose details of technology or network resources used to provide the service. For example, in the simple case of point-to-point virtual link connectivity provided by a network tunnel (such as an MPLS pseudowire) the network operator does not expose the path through the network that the tunnel follows. Of
course, this does not preclude the network operator from taking
guidance from the customer (such as to avoid routing traffic
through a particular country) or from disclosing specific details
(such as might be revealed by a route trace), but these are not
standard features of the service as described in the customer
service model.

- The network operator may use further data models (service delivery
  models) that help to describe how the service is realized in the
  network. These models might be used on the interface between the
  Service Orchestrator and the Network Orchestrator as shown in
  Figure 3 and might include many of the pieces of information from
  the customer service model alongside protocol parameters and
device configuration information. [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification]
  also terms these data
  models as "service models" and a comparison is provided in
  Section 6.1. It is important that the Service Orchestrator should
  be able to map from a customer service model to these service
delivery models, but they are not the same things.

- Commercial terms are generally not a good subject for
  standardization. It is possible that some network operators will
  enhance standard customer service models to include commercial
  information, but the way this is done is likely to vary widely
  between network operators.

- Service Level Agreements (SLAs) have a high degree of overlap with
  the definition of services present in customer service models.
  Requests for specific bandwidth, for example, might be present in
  a customer service model, and agreement to deliver a service is a
  commitment to the description of the service in the customer
  service model. However, SLAs typically include a number of fine-
grained details about how services are allowed to vary, by how
  much, and how often. SLAs are also linked to commercial terms
  with penalties and so forth, and so are also not good topics for
  standardization.

6. Comparison With Other Work

Other work has classified YANG models, produced parallel
architectures, and developed a range of YANG models. This section
briefly examines that other work and shows how it fits with the
description of service models introduced in this document.
6.1. Comparison With Network Service Models

As previously noted, [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification] provides a classification of YANG data models. It introduces the term "Network Service YANG Module" to identify the type of model used to "describe the configuration, state data and operations of an abstract representation of a service implemented on one or multiple network elements." These are service delivery models as described in this document, that is, they are the models used on the interface between the Service Orchestrator or OSS/BSS and the Network Orchestrator as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 1 of [I-D.ietf-netmod-yang-model-classification] can be modified to make this more clear and to add an additional example of a Network Service YANG model as shown in Figure 4.
6.2. Service Delivery Model Work

A number of IETF working groups are developing YANG models related to services. These models focus on how the network operator configures the network through protocols and devices to deliver a service.
A sample set of these models is listed here:

- [I-D.dhjain-bess-bgp-l3vpn-yang] defines a YANG model that can be used to configure and manage BGP Layer 3 VPNs.

- [I-D.ietf-bess-l2vpn-yang] documents a YANG model that it is expected will be used by the management tools run by the network operators in order to manage and monitor the network resources that they use to deliver L2VPN services.

- [I-D.ietf-bess-evpn-yang] defines YANG models for delivering an Ethernet VPN service.

All of these models are service delivery models in the context of this document.

### 6.3. Customer Service Model Work

Several initiatives within the IETF are developing customer service models. The most advanced presents the Layer Three Virtual Private Network (L3VPN) service as described by a network operator to a customer. This L3VPN service model (L3SM) is documented in [I-D.ietf-l3sm-l3vpn-service-model] where its usage is described as in Figure 5 which is reproduced from that document. As can be seen, the L3SM is a customer service model as described in this document.

```
+-----------------+  +-----+
| Orchestration | < --- > | OSS |
+-----------------+  +-----+
+-----------------+  +-----+
| Config manager |
+-----------------+  +-----+
| Netconf/CLI ... |
+----------------------------------+
| Network |
```

Figure 5: The L3SM Service Architecture

A Layer Two VPN service model (L2SM) is defined in [I-D.wen-l2sm-l2vpn-service-model]. That model’s usage is described...
as in Figure 6 which is a reproduction of Figure 5 from that document. As can be seen, the L2SM is a customer service model as described in this document.

Figure 6: The L2SM Service Architecture

6.4. The MEF Architecture

The MEF has developed an architecture for network management and operation. Part of this is shown reproduced in Figure 7.

As can be seen from the figure, the MEF has named the interfaces that it has defined within its architecture. In the context of this document:

- ALEGRO is the interface on which customer service models are used
- PRESTO is the interface on which service delivery models are used.
7. Further Concepts

This section introduces a few further, more advanced concepts

7.1. Technology Agnostic

Service models should generally be technology agnostic. That is to say, the customer should not care how the service is provided so long as the service is delivered.
However, some technologies reach the customer site and make a definition to the type of service delivered. Such features do need to be described in the service model.

Two examples are:

- The data passed between customer equipment and network operator equipment will be encapsulated in a specific way, and that data plane type forms part of the service.

- Protocols that are run between customer equipment and network operator equipment (for example, Operations, Administration, and Maintenance protocols, or protocols for exchanging routing information) need to be selected and configured as part of the service description.

7.2. Relationship to Policy

Policy appears as a crucial function in many places during network orchestration. A Service Orchestrator will, for example, apply the network operator’s policies to determine how to provide a service for a particular customer (possibly considering commercial terms). However, the policies within a service model are limited to those over which a customer has direct influence, but which are acted on by the network operator.

The policies that express desired behavior of services on occurrence of specific events are close to SLA definitions: they should only be included in the base service model where they are common to all network operators’ offerings. Policies that describe who at a customer may request or modify services (that is, authorization) are close to commercial terms: they, too, should only be included in the base service model where they are common to all network operators’ offerings.

Nevertheless, policy is so important that all service models should be designed to be easily extensible to allow policy components to be added and associated with services as needed.

7.3. Operator-Specific Features

When work in Layer Three Virtual Private Network Service Model (L3SM) was started, there was some doubt as to whether network operators would be able to agree on a common description of the services that they offer to their customers because, in a competitive environment, each markets the services in a different way with different additional features. Thus, when a basic description of the core service is agreed and documented in a service model, it is important
that that model should be easily extended or augmented by each network operator so that the standardized model can be used in a common way and only the operator-specific features vary from one environment to another.

7.4. Supporting Multiple Services

Network operators will, in general, offer many different services to their customers. Each would normally be the subject of a separate service model.

It is an implementation and deployment choice whether all service models are processed by a single Service Orchestrator that can coordinate between the different services, or whether each service model is handled by a specialized Service Orchestrator able to provide tuned behavior for a specific service.

8. Security Considerations

TBD

9. Manageability Considerations

TBD

10. IANA Considerations

This document makes no requests for IANA action
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