

LMAP Framework

draft-ietf-lmap-framework-03

Philip Eardley, Al Morton, Marcelo Bagnulo,
Trevor Burbridge, Paul Aitken, Aamer Akhter

24th July 2014

Toronto, IETF-90

Progress since last IETF

- -03 to -04
 - Updates from 1st WGLC and agreements in London IETF
 - Implementation & deployment decide on the granularity at which an Instruction Message works
 - Appendix added with examples of Measurement Agents and Peers in various deployment scenarios. To help clarify what these terms mean
- -04 to -05
 - Updates from 2nd WGLC
 - Measurement Method, specified as a URI to a registry entry (rather than a URN)
 - Removed mention of Data Transfer Tasks. This abstraction is left to the information model i-d
- -05 to -06
 - Different roles in a Measurement Method (requester and responder, for instance)
 - Suppression: there is now the concept of a flag (boolean) which indicates whether a Task is by default gets suppressed or not.
 - The optional suppression message (with list of specific tasks/schedules to suppress) over-rides this flag.
- -06 to -07
 - Editorials
- Overall – keeping aligned with Information Model i-d
- Comments in 3rd WGLC (next slide)
 - Thanks to Ken Ko, Dan Romascanu, Juergen Schoenwaelder
 - Consensus that ready for IESG
 - Will update in next week or two

WGLC #3 comments

- What does the MA do if it gets a 2nd suppress message?
 - Replaces the previous info
- Suppress with option listing both specific Tasks and Schedules to suppress. Is this allowed? What does MA do?
 - Yes. MA suppresses everything in either list (the Union)
- Suppression flag.
 - Is this an Input Parameter for the Measurement Method, or is it better to define as a new field?
- Measurement Method role:
 - Is this an Input Parameter for the Measurement Method, or is it better to define as a new field?
- Network address used for the measurements needs to be reported
 - Agree. Also needs adding to Info model
- The time of the acquisition of the Management Results is included in the reports – is there any requirement on a minimal granularity, or clocks synchronization?
 - No, this is just the MA's estimate of the time
- I would have preferred the document to be more concise and less repetitive. ... I suggest to move section 6 into the appendix next to the deployment examples (or even better merge the section with appendix A since there is yet more redundancy)
 - Move S6 to Appendix

- That's it ... until we get IESG comments