PPVPN WG

- Chair(s): Rick Wilder rwilder@masergy.com

    Marco Carugi marco.carugi@nortelnetworks.com

- Mailing List
    - Discussion: **ppvpn@nortelnetworks.com**
    - To Subscribe: lyris@nortelnetworks.com
      In Body: (UN)SUBSCRIBE ppvpn in message body

- Mail Archive and informal PPVPN server
    - **http://standards.nortelnetworks.com/ppvpn/**
    - **you may find SF agenda with URLs for drafts**

Administrativia

- Minutes :   Ananth Nagarajan
- Text conferencing :   Paul Knight

- All : circulate the blue sheets

- Speakers :
    - sign the paper of meeting presentations
    - send your presentation (proceedings, PPVPN server)

Updated milestones

DONE :

- Formulate a plan, approach SPs for input on scaling, other reqts
- Begin discussion of framework, requirements
- First set of candidate approaches, begin discussion against requirements
- Begin discussion of Applicability Statements (AS)
- Submit the layer 3 requirement and the layer 3 framework documents to the IESG for consideration as Informational RFCs

NOT DONE :

- MAR 03 Begin submission of the candidate L3 approaches and related applicability statements to IESG publication
- APR 03   Submit the layer 2 requirement and the layer 2 framework documents to the IESG for consideration as Informational RFCs
- JUN 03   Begin submission of the candidate L2 approaches and related applicability statements to IESG for publication
- NOV 03 Charter update or WG disband

WG doc status

Back to IESG review in few days

draft-ietf-ppvpn-framework-07.txt (L3 framework to Info RFC)
- first round of extensive comments on 06 version from Alex on 11.02
- 07 version back to IESG on 6.02.03
- OK from Alex on 24.02.03
- other IESG members' comments (10) received on 6.03.03
- plan to send ID back to IESG in few days

draft-ietf-ppvpn-requirements-05.txt (L3 reqts to Info RFC)
- 05 version published on 11.02 after first round of IESG comments
- OK from Alex on 24.02.03 (in parallel with OK on L3 framework)
- other IESG members' comments (9) received on 6.03.03
- plan to send ID back to IESG in few days

draft-ietf-ppvpn-generic-reqts-02.txt (Generic reqts to Info RFC)
- IESG evaluation started on 17.01.03
- first IESG comments (10) received on 26.02.03 and others (7) on 3.02.03
- plan to send ID back to IESG in few days

WG documents status (2)

New WG documents after Atlanta

- draft-augustyn-ppvpn-l2vpn-requirements-02.txt
  - it will be renamed , replacing draft-ietf-ppvpn-vpls-requirements-01.txt

-draft-rosen-vpns-ospf-bgp-mpls-06.txt
  - complementary ID (draft-rosen-ospf-2547bis-dn-00.txt) submitted to OSPF WG (possible adoption as OSPF WG item soon after SF)

WG documents status (3)

WG document targeted to disappear

draft-ietf-ppvpn-ce-based-03.txt
- partially integrated in L3 framework , partially evolved to solution ID
- see Jeremy's talk (draft-declercq-ppvpn-ce-based-sol-00.txt)

draft-ietf-ppvpn-applicability-guidelines-01.txt : progress is unclear

To be moved into the WG
- **Soon after SF** : **draft-andersson-ppvpn-terminology-03.txt**
  - to come this week , just missed the deadline
  - terminology cleaned up for reference to only L3 and L3 reqts and fmwk
- **In some weeks** : **L2 solution documents**
  - based on compliance to reqts, mailing list discussion and support

- **Planned progress into the WG will be stopped :**
  - **draft-andersson-ppvpn-metrics-01.txt**
    - L2 reqts is the basic reference for solutions

L3 solution space

WG Last Call in few weeks

`Conditional to IESG approval of L3 Reqts and framework`

draft-ietf-ppvpn-rfc2547bis (to PS)
draft-ietf-ppvpn-vpn-vr   (to PS)

- **Protocol dependencies with other WGs**
  draft-rosen-ppvpn-2547bis-protocol-02.txt
  draft-knight-ppvpn-vr-protocol-00.txt

- **Parallel submission of related Applicability Statements**
  draft-ietf-ppvpn-as2547-01.txt
  draft-ietf-ppvpn-as-vr-01.txt

  IPR on 2547

L3 solution space (2)

WG Last Call will follow in reasonable timing for :

- other 2547-based solution documents
    - 2547bis with IPSec, IPV6, CE-CE auth. …
- similarly for VR (for any possible complementary doc – no docs at this point)

- L3 solution-specific MIBs
    draft-ietf-ppvpn-mpls-vpn-mib-05.txt
    draft-ietf-ppvpn-vr-mib-04
    draft-ietf-ppvpn-tc-mib-02

CE-based IPSec VPN solution
- 00 just coming
- AS to be progressed in parallel
- MIB(s) needed
- target for WG Last Call < next IETF meeting

L2 space

Reqts and framework are WG docs

- L2 reqts ID needs wider review by the WG
    - new comments (text clarifications, editorial) by members of L2 DT
    - scalability considerations to be changed (remove figures and include parameters to be used in solutions' scalability section)
    - more formal structure under discussion (to be used more easily when filling the solutions' reqts compliance section)
    - Target for submission to IESG : May ?

- L2 Framework is in quite good shape
    - security section added
    - requested review by IEEE 802.1 people two weeks ago
    - CE-based L2VPN model under analysis (author's justification expected)
    - Target for submission to IESG : end April/early May ?

No WG document in the solution space up to now

Design teams

All teams have basically concluded their tasks except for L2 design team

L2 design team

- **extended list (24 people)**
- **one meeting and one conf call after Atlanta (Jan 27th, Feb 21st)**
- **outcome on solution space discussion sent to the list on 28.02.03**
- **met yesterday officially for last time, it closes now and all L2 discussions go on the mailing list**
- **DT list will continue to live until completion of L2 reqts and L2 framework**

L2 DT discussions on solution space

- **Functional decomposition recommended in Atlanta**
  - **functional documents to be produced**
- **What was the plan for the solution documents**
  - **Aligned with the functional decomposition and (optional) template**
  - **Section justifying specific combination(s) of functional options**
  - **All possible options for the same function to be documented**
  - **Different solutions using same option for a specific function MUST relay on same functional document**

- **L2 DT meeting - Billerica, Jan 27th : meeting objectives**
  - **functional documents 00**
  - **each solution doc restructured according to template**
  - **discussion on solution convergence, finalisation of a candidate solution set for WG discussion**

L2 DT discussions (2)

- **Main results of Billerica L2 DT meeting (AD attended too)**
  - functional work : heavy, not necessary for most members
  - => effort discontinued (other guys interested to work on that ?)
    - unclear at this point if functional docs will be progressed (ex. autodiscovery drafts)
  - solutions will have to include a reqts compliance section
    - reference to L2 reqts document
    - will facilitate discussion
  - DT doesn't recommend any specific solution ID to the WG
    - discussion on solution IDs to be done on the list
    - decision to move the most supported IDs into the WG according to this discussion
  - exp or standard track options
    - experimental has the favor, but need to listen to the WG

The status today

• **Optional template has not been always adopted : minor point**
• **Current shape of the L2 reqts doc doesn't make writing of reqts compliance section always easy**
• **Few solution IDs currently contain the reqts compliance section**
• **Discussion on various solutions has not happened yet**

PROGRESS NEEDED SOON :
⇒ **ASAP : Authors to update solution IDs with reqts compliance section**
⇒ **ASAP : Authors to start solution WG discussion on the list**
⇒ **IN SOME WEEKS (IF DISCUSSION STARTS NOW) :**
WG to select of a number of WG docs in L2 solution space
Further work : L2 AS and L2 MIBs (Design Teams ?)
Schedule for progress of WG documents needs to be confirmed
⇒ **current milestone : L2 solution submission to IESG in June**

Set of candidate L2 solutions

- A number of drafts on VPWS, VPLS

- We will not propose here a set of candidate IDs

- Authors should do this directly on the list

- Agenda today : we have only 4 L2 solution drafts
    - just because we only received those requests for slot
    - no intention to put in value some solutions more than others
    - 2 of them are completely new

Exp vs standard track

Option to move solution IDs to experimental track first
- most of DT members in favor
- some opposed , some don't care

Rational for experimental :
- it will give time to SPs to experiment, deploy, identify issues
- Enhancements and merging of solutions will be stimulated along this path
- SP feedback will drive appropriate choice of solutions to inject in standard track in a second phase
- Main formal difference with standard track :
  - exp docs cannot be normative references for other bodies

- Need the view of the WG on this

Protocol extensions in PPVPN

Clear need to have strict relationship with protocol-specific WGs

- **Ex. PWE3 for LDP signalling discussions**
- **According to protocol extensions required in PPVPN, involve as soon as possible guys of related protocol WG in our discussions**

Evaluate interest to recharter at a certain point to eliminate current restriction on protocol development inside PPVPN WG

Items on which WG input is needed to focus further work

PPVPN frameworks for :

- Quality of service
- Operation and Management
- Security

Today's agenda ; status, proposals for development in some areas

Input from the WG is required

Target : WG documents in July

Other items to be progressed

L2 Interworking : proposal to focus for now on requirements

- **SP input needed to extend current L2 reqts text (on the list)**

- **Objective is identification of most important L2 IW scenarios**

- **We'll then define where we should and could work**

  - Positioning towards other bodies (ITU, MPLSF, ATMF, MEF, …) working in this area

  - Use existing pieces of technology defined elsewhere where possible

  - Define the other pieces needed to fulfill our reqts

Service OAM : proposal to start from the Op and Mgt framework

- **Some guys involved in this work now**

- **Functions/tools to be provided (customer, SP)**

- **Service scenarios (both L3 and L2 spaces)**

- **Solutions to be defined from there**

  - Maximise commonalities in mechanisms where possible

  - Best use of lower level OAM mechanisms (ex. MPLS, PW)

Other items

Multicast : framework ID to WG doc ? work on solutions ?
  – input from SP is wished (scenarios, reqts)

L1/Optical VPNs :charter review needed, std bodies cooperation

Wireless and VPNs :
  – service scenarios and requirements
  –further steps to be defined (charter review ?)

Backup slides
(not presented)

ITU-T progress on L1/OVPNs

- Q11/13 meeting – October 2002, Geneva

  Started new draft Recommendation Y.l1vpnsdr (« L1 VPN Requirements and Architecture »)

    - Service definitions, scenarios, requirements and basic architecture

  - Target for consent is next July 2003 SG13 meeting

  - Liaisons sent to SG15, OIF , IETF PPVPN for comments

  - **Contributions are invited to next Rapporteur's meeting**

    - Sophia Antipolis (near Nice, France) on March 31-April 4 2003

    - Focus on service architectures (see additional document in liaison)

    - IETF guys invited as individual contributors

    - Will probably produce official input to IETF to work on specific items

  Liaison and documents distributed to the list and available on

  - **PPVPN informal Web site**

  - **ITU-T site (SG13-IETF exchange area, need to subscribe)**

Main functional blocks (from Marco's PPVPN WG status in Atlanta)

Discovery
- OPTIONS for discovery : BGP, Directory-based, (LDP) , …

Signaling
- OPTIONS for signaling : LDP, BGP, L2TPv3, (RSVP-TE), …

PW tunneling (encaps)
- OPTIONS for tunneling : MPLS, L2TPV3,   GRE, …
  and data plane forwarding

Informational model
- UNDER STUDY (SINGLE OPTION is wished)

To constitute the core sections of each solution document
- template under review (deployment scenarios etc.)