XRBLOCK WG Meeting

Date and Time: THURSDAY, March 22, 2018
1500-1530, Afternoon Session I

WG chairs could not attend IETF101. Roni Even chairing.

1. Note Well, Note Takers, Jabber Scribes, Agenda Bashing - Chairs (5 min)
Jabber: Jonathan Lennox
Note taker: Bo Burman

2. XRBLOCK WG Status Update - Chairs (5 min)

3. ippm initial registry entries for xrblock metrics - Rachel (10 min)
   - draft-ietf-ippm-initial-registry
   - Roni: Is there interest in XRBLOCK to register in IPPM?
   - Al Morton: The sample registry of XR is 7 pages long. Have done early work with IANA to achieve a registry. We're in fact getting an entirely new name space. The problem is that it needs some level of specificity for the items on the first page. This is just to understand the level of effort. Think about this as a document from this WG that would fit the registry format. It was supposed to be IETF work.
   - Colin: Very happy if Rachel accepts to do more work. Why should this WG care? Have not seen a compelling argument.
   - Jonathan: Would be happy if it is XRBLOCK.
   - Roni: Will people read or appreciate this work?
   - Rachel: Not only RTP endpoints can use metrics, but also other middleboxes could use the information without implementing RTCP.
   - Colin: But they can do this without the registry?
   - Roni: The question is if it should be a single place or several places.
   - Colin: Maybe there is a name spacing issue. If it is just for the sake of keeping a registry...
   - Al: The registry wanted to nail down how to use and interpret those IPPM metrics. For good comparability you want those fixed.
   - Roni: We take this discussion to the list.

4. Effective Loss Index Reporting - Qin (10 min)
   - Rachel presented.
• draft-zheng-xrblock-effective-loss-index

• https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/101/materials/slides-101-xrblock-effective-loss-index-00

• Roni: Did anyone read this document? No indication. We need to decide how to work in this WG.

• Colin: This comes down to the approach that the chairs take. This is technically straightforward and fits the existing architecture. The reason the chairs question if it should be adopted is if there are others interested in the work.

• Rachel: This type of reporting is needed.

• Jonathan: Have you received feedback other than the authors?

• Rachel: Didn't ask vendors.

5. Next Steps

• The current two chairs do not have the resources to participate in face-to-face meetings.

• Ben: Who in the room has an implementation that consumes XR? Two answers. No time to discuss next steps now, but send opinions to Ben and/or the mailing list. We decide before next meeting.

Reading List

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-zheng-xrblock-effective-loss-index/
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-ippm-initial-registry/