Routing Area Open Meeting
Prague, March 2011

Area Directors
Adrian Farrel <adrian.farrel@huawei.com>
Stewart Bryant <stbryant@cisco.com>

Note Well

- Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:
    - The IETF plenary session
    - The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
    - Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
    - Any IETF working group or portion thereof
    - The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
    - The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function
- All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).
- Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.
- Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.
- A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.
- A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Note Also…

- Please state your name clearly before speaking at the microphone
- Audio streams at http://tools.ietf.org/agenda/80/
- Jabber
  - Please try to have someone monitor jabber in your meetings
  - http://www.ietf.org/meeting/80/jabber.html
  - This meeting at rtgarea@jabber.ietf.org
- You *do* know about the Routing Area mailing list?
  - routing-discussion@ietf.org
- And the Routing Area wiki?
  - http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/rtg/trac/wiki/WikiStart
- Blue Sheets
- Minutes

Today's Agenda

- Administrivia
- Working Group Reports
- Heads-up (Dimitri):
  Learning-Capable Communication Networks
- Thoughts about running WG meetings (ADs)
- draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-ptn
  - Refresher on RFC5026 and RFC4929 (ADs)
  - History of this draft (ADs)
  - Liaison and draft (Malcolm Betts)
  - Advice for next steps (ADs)
- Open Discussion / Any Other business

Working Group Reports

- BFD
- CCAMP
- FORCES
- IDR
- IS-IS
- KARP
- L2VPN
- L3VPN
- MANET

- MPLS
  - MPLS-TP
- OSPF
- PCE
- PIM
- PWE3
- ❏ ROLL
- RTGWG
- SIDR
- ❏ VRRP

ROLL WG Update - Routing Area

- Major milestone for the WG
  - draft-ietf-roll-rpl => RFC Ed queue
  - draft-ietf-roll-routing-metrics => RFC Ed queue
  - draft-ietf-roll-trickle-02 => RFC 6206
  - draft-ietf-roll-security-framework => New revision to be submitted (3 DISCUSS)
  - draft-ietf-roll-of0 => Passed WG Last Call
  - Note that the two 6Man IDs (RPL option HbH header and RH4 passed WG Last Call) => Publication request
    => The core specification of RPL is DONE

- 15 implementations
- RPL adopted by other SDOs/Alliance: IEEE P1901.2, Wavenis, Zigbee/IP
- Next steps
  - Work on applicability statements
  - On-going discussion about new potential items

VRRP WG Status

- Mukesh Gupta, Juniper Networks
  Radia Perlman, Intel

- VRRP unified MIB
  - AD Review Done. Comments being incorporated by the author.
  - Updated draft will be published after the IETF

- 3 Individual drafts submitted but no discussion on the WG or request for adoption
  - draft-hu-vrrp-trill: Extending VRRP for TRILL campus
  - draft-zhai-vrrp-extension-ft-fm: Extensions to VRRP for Fast Transition of Failed Master
  - draft-zhang-vrrp-gr: Extending VRRP for Graceful Restart

Heads Up

Learning-Capable Communication Networks (LCCN)

Dimitri Papadimitriou (dimitri.papadimitriou@alcatel-lucent.com)

Running WG Meetings

- Ideas from Ops Area WG Chairs
- The IETF suffers from a PowerPoint disease
  - Everyone wants to _present_ their draft
- Agenda time is getting *really* squeezed
  - Does your WG really need 2 meeting slots?
  - Do you really need so much face-to-face time?
  - Could you achieve more from face-to-face time?
- Get back to basics
  - No presentations
  - What are _you_ doing at the meeting?
  - What do you want other people to do?
- Do you _really_ need to have a slot in > 1 WG?

Get Back to Basics

- Assume everyone (who cares) has read (will read) your draft
  - You do not need to summarise your draft
  - You may give (only) one or two bullets to set context

Why Are You Standing Up the Front?

- You are not there:
  - To justify your travel budget
  - To ask people to read your draft
  - To introduce your draft
  - To explain things that should be in your draft
- So there must be some other reason…
  - There is a debate raging on the list
  - You are stuck with something

What Do You Want the WG To Do?

- Ask your question or make your request
- Guide the discussion
- Try to get answers during the meeting
- Set people up to do specific tasks

How Does this Affect the Meeting?

- You need to prime the meeting
  - Use the mailing list
  - Post your slides early
  - Wouldn't it be good if your question was already answered before the meeting?
- Chairs need to be harsher with the agenda slots
  - Ask people what it is they want to discuss when they request a slot
  - Don't allow things on the agenda without a clear purpose

You Discuss

MPLS-TP Codepoints

- draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-ptn-00.txt
  - Submitted by the ITU-T Secretariat (TSB)
- Refresher on RFC 5026 and RFC 4929
  - RFCs that control the IETF process
- History of this draft
  - Where does it come from?
  - Why was it submitted?
- Liaison and draft (Malcolm)
  - Recent liaison from ITU-T SG15
  - Current draft and plans
- Advice for next steps
  - How should the authors proceed?

Which Registry?

- **Pseudowire Name Spaces (PWE3) : Pseudowire Associated Channel Types**
  - http://www.iana.org/assignments/pwe3-parameters/pwe3-parameters.xml#pwe3-parameters-10

- Two registration procedures are specified
  - IETF Review
  - Reserved for Experimental Use
  - Definitions in RFC 5226

RFC 5226

- *Experimental Use - Similar to private or local use only, with the purpose being* to facilitate experimentation. *See [RFC3692] for details.*

- *IETF Review - (Formerly called "IETF Consensus") New values are assigned* only through RFCs *that have been shepherded through the IESG as* AD-Sponsored or IETF WG Documents *[RFC3932] [RFC3978]. The intention is that* the document and proposed assignment will be reviewed by the IESG and appropriate IETF WGs *(or experts, if suitable working groups no longer exist) to ensure that the proposed assignment will not negatively impact interoperability or otherwise extend IETF protocols in an inappropriate or damaging manner.*

RFC 4929

- This assignment is requested for use in MPLS
- That means this draft falls under RFC 4929
  - *Change Process for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) Protocols and Procedures*
  - We are bound to that process
- *Before the IETF can formally pronounce on requests to change or extend the (G)MPLS protocols, a requirements statement I-D MUST be written*
  - *Preliminary discussions may help endure requirements statement Internet-Drafts contain the right material*
  - *a problem statement I-D MAY be produced to help further the discussions and to clarify the issues being addressed*
  - *The objective of the […] evaluation process is to determine a clear and complete statement of the requirements for changes or extensions to the (G)MPLS protocols.*
- *…any forum not following [this process], when applying for IANA assignment or IETF publication, will be delayed until this procedure has been completed.*

4929 Process – Page 11

```
  Start                      +------------+
    |                        |optional    |
    +--<--------------------|preliminary  |<-------Start
    |                        |investigation|
    V                        +------------+
+------------+        +---------+           +---------+
|requirements| discussion |review by|    YES    |  IESG   | YES
|statement   |----------->|WG chairs|------------->|decision |------+
|I-D         | on mailing |and ADs  | request to  |         |      |
+------------+    list    +---------+ IESG to     +---------+      |
                      |            appoint REWG   |            |
                      |NO          and charter    |NO       REWG|
                      V            req eval        |    chartered|
              +------------+                       |    to work on|
              |response    |                       |  requirements|
              |to the      |                       |    statement|
              |requirements|<-----------------+                 |
            +->|statement   |<---------------+                  |
            |  +------------+                |                   |
            |        ^                       |                   |
          NO|        |     NO                |                   |
            |    +-----------------+         |                   V
            |    |                 |         | NO     +------+
        +--------+           +-------+    +--------| REWG |
        | IESG/  |    YES    | AD    |    |        | req  |
+-----------|decision|<--------------|review |<-----------| eval |
|PSWG       |        |     request to |       |    YES     |      |
|chartered  +--------+     IESG to    +-------+            +------+
|to work                  approve I-D
|                         and charter
|                         PSWG (if needed)
|        +---------+
|        | IETF    |                    +-----+
+--------->|  PSWG   |-----/ /---->| RFC |
    +---->| process |              +-----+
    |        +---------+
  solutions
     I-D
```

History

- SG15 plenary summer 2010
  - Instructed ITU-T Director to request a code point
- Informal exchange of emails between ITU-T Director and IETF chair
  - Discussion of how to proceed according to RFC 5226
  - IETF chair makes no specific request for action
- draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-ptn-00
  - Posted February 1st 2011
  - Informed to ADs February 14th 2011
    - Immediately asked author for his intentions
      - "wait for outcome of February plenary meeting"
  - Liaison received March 14th 2011
    - Response from IESG due April 1st
    - Indicates that new draft revision is pending

Liaison and Draft

Malcolm Betts

Next Steps

- We have no way to handle an isolated codepoint allocation request
  - We are bound by our processes
- Read and understand RFC 4929
- Explain and discuss requirements
  - Separate them from your preferred solution
- Understand the need for IETF consensus
  - At each stage of the process