

IETF 101 - London  
First LSVR Meeting  
Chairs: Gunter Van De Velde, Victor Kuarsingh  
Monday 13:30

Volunteers:

Minutes: Nabeel Cocker  
Jabber: John Scudder

Agenda: welcome by the chairs

Note Well  
Agenda bashing  
Presentation and agreement of the LSVR charter

-----

(Agenda item#1) Shortest Path Routing Extensions for BGP Protocol  
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-keyupate-lsvr-bgp-spf-00>  
(Keyur Patel)  
(slides)

Proposed solution helps towards deployment of Route Controllers and yet preserve operational simplicity by using BGP  
Foundation technology well deployed, well adopted in networks, etc  
New SAFI defined to avoid backward compatibility issues  
Encoding==BGP-LS  
comment from Acee: comment that using xxxx not new and are in use today  
(Gunter VdV (Chair), Nokia) Poll from chair: how many people read it? +-20 people read draft (approx.. 1/5 of attendees)

No questions from the floor

(Chair) document written here reads as an extension to BGP, and not as a specification of LSVR, and that is something that needs to be addressed when this work moves forward  
(Gunter VdV) The draft documents differences between normal spf and strict spf  
(Acee) We are using same IANA registry that IGP's use. Difference between normal spf and strict is that normal spf can be overridden by local policy. Strict SPF MUST take shortest path. This was discussed ad nauseum in ISIS WG. We're inheriting this distinction.  
(Gunter VdV, co-chair) Keyur, which support from the WG do you need to progress? What are you looking for?  
(Keyur) Does solution need refinements? Deployment use cases? What/how? Implementors - prototypes and interop testing?  
(Acee) Most valuable would be prototype. Not sure if this is THE answer for DC, otherwise I wouldn't be spending time on this.  
(Gunter VdV) Keyur, Could you create a list of items for WG feedback?

(Keyur) Sure. Issue call for adoption?

(George Swallow, Cisco) Providers think "this will happen if IETF does it or not".

(Gunter VdV, co-chair) People who have read/would have read: People willing to give feedback in next two weeks?

(Álvaro Retana (Routing AD), Huawei): Happy to see all of you. Disappointed that there are no questions. READ THIS document. The WG is not intended to only rubber stamp this work.

(Gunter VdV) Will submit adoption call in the LSVR working group. Looking for feedback - positive and negative. Please don't be silent. Would like to move this forward.

(Agenda item#2) LSRV BGP SPF Applicability

<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-keyupate-lsvr-applicability-00>

(Acee Lindem)

(slides)

(Acee) Please don't read this doc version. Please read NEXT version as that will have the things in there I am discussing here.

(Gunter VdV (co-chair)) When is next revision coming out?

(Acee) Before April 14.

(Jeffrey Haas, Juniper) Chairs brought up needing YANG model and one of these drafts need to talk about how this inter-acts with the existing BGP YANG model

(Yan Filyurin, Bloomberg) Great you have yet another protocol, but I only think this is applicable if I am building a DC, not sure I see too much value in this being used elsewhere

(Acee Lindem, Cisco) why do you say that?

(Albert Fu) Reason: primary applicability is if you are building irregular topologies, then this is what you should be aiming for..

(Acee) then what are you using for the fat trees?

(Acee) in a CLOS topology, LFA does not buy you alot, massively ECMP, non-looping topology, but you could use BGP SPF in different topologies, say out side of this working group and you wanted to use BGP on a ring for example

(Victor Kuarsingh) xxxxxx

(Chair Gunter VdV) lots of BGP AFI/SAFIs over the same single BGP session. How do you see this going forward? Is the intent to mandatory exclude all the non-LSVR AFI/SAFI when LSVR AFI/SAFI is enabled

(Keyur Patel, Arccus) since this is a different SAFI you could have an independent session. It is operators call.

(Jeff Haas) Keyur, if this was normal routing, I would agree, but this is latency sensitive, I would recommend that you advocate for separation of sessions

(Keyur) I am fine with that

(Acee) the same way we recommeded that you give the BGP SFP a different Admin Pref, we should do something similar here

(Alvaro Retana, Huawei) Jeff's comments are very valid

(Acee) lets start a conversation on the list  
(Victor Kuarsingh (not as chair), Oracle) from operational background, I have always thought that having options has been beneficial. Choice is important. On the comment on simplicity, recommendation is good, options better/necessary (Jeff Haas, Juniper) for normal BGP tcp timers tuning, backoff etc, latency in the DC will be critical and so need to address this in the base and not just applicability draft

(Agenda item#3) Link State over Ethernet  
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ymbk-lsvr-lsoe-00>  
(Randy Bush)  
(slides)

(Randy Bush, IJ/Arrcus) Comment to Acee: one hop TTL security does not cut it (Acee, Cisco) I think we need to decided do we want something that is going to work better that is applicable to our scenario. This would work better than LLDP specifically for this task. For BGP this is doing something customized.  
(Randy Bush) this is not customized for BGP, north bound you have that shim.  
(Acee) this would be a non-proprietary solution  
(Jeff Haas) I was thinking something like this. It has overlap with two IGP hellos, and does it make sense to look at a shortcut to those  
(Alia, Juniper) xxxxxx  
(Gunter VdV (co-chair)) a lean discovery mechanism is a good way to do without attached IPR, this is a potential solution, amongst other solutions. Lets have a discussion on the list about the path forward. I expect to see a good discussion on the next interim  
(Jeff Tantsura, Nuage networks) If it has wider applicability take this to the RTG WG

-----

Chair Closure remarks  
(Viktor Kuarsingh, Oracle/Dyn)

(Viktor) we would like to probe the question to adopt the LSVR specification draft as WG document on LSVR email list document ASAP. Within next two weeks. Then we want the 2nd document to also be discussed and look for adoption into the WG once the document is updated as suggested by Acee. The 3rd doc (ethernet controlplane), may be looking for a wider audience. But we want to have something in that space  
(Jeff Haas) for the Ethernet Control : the state in the doc is pretty good.  
Necessary work  
(Keyur) We presented it here because what would be useful would be a good neighbor discovery. A generic mechanism would really be good. Therefore I believe it should be worked on, here or within RTG. But this is necessary work  
(Acee) I would like to note that Gunter's comment about document LSVR

structure was made after he was co-author of the BGP-SPF draft  
(Randy Bush) If it needs to be split into multiple rfcs then there's a problem with  
it.