

Layer Independent OAM Management in the Multi-Layer Environment (lime)

Meeting: IETF 92, Tuesday, March 24 2015 17:30.

Location: Fairmont Dallas, Continental.

Chairs: Ron Bonica rbonica@juniper.net, Carlos Pignataro cpignata@cisco.com

Scribe: Daniel King daniel@olddog.co.uk

Jabber: lime@jabber.ietf.org

URL: <http://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/lime/charter/>

Agenda: version 1.0

OAM Model Design Team Report (17:40-18:20)

Presenter Qin Wu

Yuji: Commonalities between IP and Ethernet, MPLS and other technologies exist. This could be in the draft, or a gap analysis document? Maybe highlight other Standards Development Organisation (SDO) efforts on the OAM information model for common architectures. These would provide good input for the LIME working group.

Deepak: At the last session we were told to only look at the IETF OAM.

Greg: Understand the interest for generic mode (across SDOs), but we need to start within IETF initially. Agree in principle.

Yuji: I would like to echo earlier comments

Iftekar: If the intention is generic model for multiple layers, that's a good intention. Single layer is not good enough.

Benoit: The charter is clear. See milestones and scope. We need a consistent model to start with. The WG will not develop any new OAM protocols.

Iftekar: Well I am not sure what we are solving then.

Benoit: Please see charter.

Adrian: If you see Charter, it really does state what is in scope, and what the problem space is.

Jeff: You need to highlight which IETF technologies are applicable, a legacy artefact is that some IETF technologies have not been designed with OAM in mind. In order to deliver OAM you need to establish the addressable end-points to run a test at. If I want to test, I know where it is, here is my API/protocol mechanism to cause the test.

Greg: If we talk about CFM/Trill/MPLS, it can have multiple providers, it has layers, gives you different scope in the same domain. This is not part of the MPLS OAM model. How to correlate explicit to implicit, which has been the discussion in the DT, do we need to build explicit IP OAM model similar to CFM and the rest. Or what we can achieve is only defect correlation. These are the intense discussions.

Tom (via Jabber): Greg was emphasizing need for multi-endpoint OAM at IP level. I was concerned that defect detection at the IP layer requires monitoring of delay and loss rates

Jeff: If you are worrying about terminology, then you potentially trap into building OAM that is too small. First you need figure out who you need to talk too.

All

Benoit: You looked at two models, can we assume that either mode would be suitable?

Qin: Common elements can be summarized into the common template.

Ron (co-chair): We could be model agnostic.

Benoit: Next step, common YANG model, agree same components. Any new common elements can be addressed in basic model. The first draft from Tissa, but we received complaints that the terminology was not suitable.

Greg: I do have a different opinion on if the model. We can see if it is applicable?

Benoit: What is missing, has the Design Team completed its role?

Ron (co-chair): Two points as individual contributor:

1. Capture clarity on Jeff and Greg's discussions (as a 5-page draft)
2. We need a new editor of the Tissa I-D, but we need to finish this

Carlos (co-chair via Jabber): I agree with Ron's two points.

Deepak: (Re: second point from Ron) I would be willing to continue Tissa work. We would want to make the model more agnostic. Using well-known terminology. Second item is that the lime model should be a super-set of all IETF technology.

Nobo (as BFD co-chair): If the design team produces a model that we can use great.

Benoit: (Re: first point) Thanks' Ron, there is an applicability document in the charter.

Benoit: (Re: design team) their job is now complete.

Ron (co-chair): We did not have a candidate for the applicability document. Deepak would you be willing to take the discussion from the room to respin the Tissa I-D?

Deepak: Yes, if there is something missing that would be useful.

Benoit: A third deliverable. Architecture for OAM that can be used for guidance for the other IETF WGs. However, a phased approach is fine.

Greg: The Design Team defect objective is one thing that also should be looked at. Including protection switch-over and alarm suppression.

Deepak: Even in current YANG mode?

Ron (co-chair): Next steps. First cut of applicability I-D and Deepak to update of the Tissa I-D.

End of Session.
