IETF 92 pim wg meeting

Note Well

This summary is only meant to point you in the right direction, and doesn't have all the nuances. The IETF's IPR Policy is set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

The brief summary:

❖ **By participating with the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes.**

❖ **If you are aware that a contribution of yours (something you write, say, or discuss in any IETF context) is covered by patents or patent applications, you need to disclose that fact.**

❖ **You understand that meetings might be recorded, broadcast, and publicly archived.**

For further information, talk to a chair, ask an Area Director, or review the following:

BCP 9 (on the Internet Standards Process)

BCP 25 (on the Working Group processes)

BCP 78 (on the IETF Trust)

BCP 79 (on Intellectual Property Rights in the IETF)

Agenda

Agenda bashing, document status	Chairs	15 min
4601bis issues	Chairs	15 min
Rechartering discussion	Chairs	30 min
YANG multicast models	Chairs	20 min
draft-yong-pim-igp-multicast-arch	Dean Cheng	20 min
draft-contreras-pim-multiple-upstreams-reqs-00	Carlos	10 min

Status 1/2

- draft-ietf-pim-rfc4601bis
  - With the IESG, one open issue, discuss later
- draft-ietf-pim-explicit-tracking
  - Draft was returned to WG. Authors improved the draft, we did a new WGLC and submitted it to IESG
- draft-ietf-pim-explicit-rpf-vector
  - AD found some issues. Returned to WG due to slow response from authors. New version submitted, addresses ADs concerns?
- draft-ietf-pim-drlb
  - AD found some issues. Returned to WG due to slow response from authors.

Status 2/2

– WG drafts with no updates since last IETF

- draft-ietf-pim-hierarchicaljoinattr
- draft-ietf-pim-igmp-mld-wireless-mobile
- draft-ietf-pim-source-discovery-bsr
- draft-ietf-pim-join-attributes-for-lisp

– draft-sami-pim-ng

- Author wants you to review and comment on the proposal

draft-ietf-pim-rfc4601bis

– The draft contains text in several places about the use of IPsec AH

- The IPsec [8] transport mode using the Authentication Header (AH) is the recommended method to prevent the above attacks against PIM…

- As part of advancing 4601 to Internet Standard we should remove parts of the document that have not proven to interoperate. Should we remove AH?

- 4601 or a new document can specify IPsec and PIM. ESP is recommended. We also have RFC 5796 updating 4601.

- Are you aware of deployments using PIM with IPsec? Are there deployments with multiple implementations?

YANG multicast models

- Huge interest from operators (and vendors) in developing YANG models for routing protocols.
  - A huge number of drafts all over the routing area and elsewhere in the IETF
- pim should develop multicast models, right?
  - Scope? pim-sm, bsr, igmp/mld, anything else?
  - Last time we discussed draft-liu-pim-yang-cfg-00

YANG multicast design team

– Is there interest in forming a design team?

  • Would like participants from many vendors/ operators to get good models that are likely to have WG consensus

  • Frequent meetings (at least bi-weekly) to ensure quick progress?

– The product of the design team should be to develop YANG model drafts.

– Drafts would go through the usual working group process for adoption etc.