LMAP Interim Call, 22 February 2016, 12pm - 2pm EST

Chairs: Dan Romascanu, Jason Weil

Minutes: Barbara Stark

Participants: Al Morton, Alissa Cooper, Anthony Huang, Barbara Stark, Charles Cook, Dan Romascanu, Greg Mirsky, Jason Weil, Juergen Schoenwaelder, Michael Bugenhagen, Ron Stana, Tim Carrey, Wei Chen

Agenda: https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2016/02/22/lmap/agenda/agenda-interim-2016-lmap-2

Proceedings: https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2016/02/22/lmap/proceedings.html

Chair Slides: https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2016/02/22/lmap/slides/slides-interim-2016-lmap-2-0.pdf

Dan noted well and displayed agenda (from Chair Slides). Handed off to Al Morton.

Al displayed Initial Performance Metric Registry Entries (draft-morton-ippm-initial-registry-04) draft. https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-morton-ippm-initial-registry-04

After walking through some of the initial sections, Al focused on Section 8.3.2 about Packet Generation Stream.

Is draft ready for adoption? It is an ippm draft, but most comments have come from lmap contributors. Several emails (to ippm) in support of adoption have been sent by people who have read the draft.

A next step is to implement changes in Section 4 and get more registry entries created for lmap metrics.

Do we need a registry entry for traceroute? It might be useful to specify output format. There was support for this.

Barbara mentioned that Tim Carey and Barbara are looking at how to use the registry format for a BBF registry. Tim and Barbara may submit examples of this for people to understand how the format may be used by external orgs.

Jürgen Schönwälder presented slides on information-model updates.

https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2016/02/22/lmap/slides/slides-interim-2016-lmap-2-1.pdf

Slide 2:

Tim questioned the proposed restriction that limits scheduling to second granularity. Tim suggested keeping current millisecond granularity in the information model. After discussion it was agreed to accept Jürgen‘s proposal that starting of schedules will be at second granularity. Within a schedule,

repetitions can be run at sub-second (millisecond) granularity. Randomization start time would also be specified at second intervals.

The timestamp for when measurements actually start can be recorded at millisecond.

Slide 3:

After discussion, agreed to accept proposal on Slide 3.

Slide 4:

Discussion related to cycle IDs and tags and whether it would be ok to get rid of cycle IDs and replace all with tags. This was a very long discussion

Al will write a Cycle ID definition and we will see if it is consistent with what others think. Several people believe information-model should keep Cycle ID, so there is no agreement to remove it.

It has become very clear that we need both Blue (actual "packet on the wire" measurement) and Red (schedule) timestamps in the report.

Slide 5:

Barbara, Jürgen, and Tim will take off-line the discussion regarding suppress by default behavior. Jürgen will re-read the text in information-model describing suppression behavior to see if he will change his mind.

Slide 6:

Agreed. This is OK.

Slide 7:

Agreed.

Slide 8:

Agreed that set of characters should be limited. Tim will provide pointers to TR-069 data model limitations. Still need to decide exactly what limits to impose.

Slides 9-11:

Deferred. We are at end of time.

IETF 95 planning. Jürgen will be remote.

How far are we from completing information-model? Jürgen hopes to get it mostly done by next IETF (96, in Berlin).