Generic Aggregation of Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) for IPv4 and IPv6 Reservation over PCN domains

draft-ietf-tsvwg-rsvp-pcn-03

Georgios Karagiannis, Anurag Bhargava

Outline

- Main Changes
- Received new comments
- Next steps

Main changes

All comments worked out (including PCN WG ones) according to decisions taken on mailing list and IETF 84 meeting in Vancouver:

- ❑ changed status of draft from proposed standard to experimental

- ❑ modified description of Extended Virtual Destination Port, specifies that its length is different for IPv4 and IPv6 addresses

New comments raised by Lixia and Ken (1)

- ❑ Editorial comments:
  - ○ Improve introduction section, organization and clarity of draft including a background section, better goal description and document structure description

  - ○ Eliminate given terminology that is not used in the draft

  - ○ Eliminate duplicated definitions of terminology

  - ○ Refer to a section of a particular RFC (i.e., RFC 4860), instead of referring only to that particular RFC

New comments raised by Lixia and Ken (2)

- Elaborate rationale of why it is considered that the decision point is collocated with the PCN-ingress-node
  - Signaling solution focuses only on on-path signaling to support feedback loop from egress to ingress.
  - Off-path signaling support required between edges and centralized entity is out of scope
- Recommendation to re-visit SHOULDs
  - On further review, some SHOULDs to MUSTs
  - Other SHOULDs inherited from RFC 4860, RFC 6661, RFC 6662
  - Changes will be posted on the list

Next steps

- Update draft based on received comments
- Working Group Last Call after received comments are worked out?