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## Current Milestones
### Slide One of Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVMe for pNFS</td>
<td>Std.</td>
<td>Final Doc.</td>
<td>C. Hellwig</td>
<td>6/2018</td>
<td>NVMe Slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSv4.1 Trunking Discovery</td>
<td>Std.</td>
<td>Final Doc.</td>
<td>D. Noveck</td>
<td>3/2019</td>
<td>On Track (as one document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSv4.1 Transparent State Migration</td>
<td>Std.</td>
<td>Final Doc.</td>
<td>D. Noveck</td>
<td>3/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Milestones
### Slide Two of Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDMA Layout for pNFS</td>
<td>Std.</td>
<td>Final Doc.</td>
<td>C. Hellwig</td>
<td>9/2019</td>
<td>RDMA Layout Slides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Added Milestones  
With Target Dates Before 8/2020 (Two-year window)

• Needed:  
  • An owner  
  • A target date  
  • A preliminary document (can be an I-D).  
  • Working group interest

• Some possibilities:  
  • Draft-ietf-nfsv4-integrity-measurement  
  • Other descendants of draft-cel-nfsv4-linux-seclabel-xtensions?  
  • Descendant(s) of draft-haynes-nfsv4-delstid?  
  • Flexible files v2?  
  • Does anyone know of others?
NVMe for pNFS
Current Status, Expectations, and Work Needed

• Current status:
  • Existing I-D expired with no progress beyond what was discussed at IETF 99.
  • Current target date has gone by.

• Expectations for progress:
  • Author appears interested in working on this. ↑
  • Author has not provided a new target date. ↓

• Work needed on document:
  • Implement changes discussed at IETF 99.
  • Convert to working group document
  • Working group review and discussion, including WGLC
NVMe for pNFS
Possible Actions

• Possible actions regarding current milestone:
  • Remove from milestone list.
  • Leave on list with a TBD date until author can provide one.

• Other possible actions in this area:
  • Consider whether a more limited, easily achievable milestone (e.g. an informational document) could be put on milestone list.
  • See if it is possible to accelerate progress, adding an editor or co-authors to the effort.
pNFS RDMA Layout
Current Status and Expectations

• Current Status
  • No active document (either I-D or WG document)
  • There has been some prototyping work based on the original expired document.

• Expectations for progress
  • Prototype work has raised additional issues that may need to be addressed in this document. ↓
  • Author still interested in working in this area. ↑
  • Existing target date (9/2019) for final document submission still in effect ↔.
  • Need to consider how realistic that date is (see Next Slide)
  • Needed work on NVMe document is a potential complicating factor. ↓
pNFS RDMA Layout

Issues/Actions Regarding Milestone Target Date

• Need to consider plausibility of current target date, in light of:
  • Lack of progress since IETF 99.
  • Author’s lack of communication with the working group.

• Need to determine work needed for completion and assess:
  • Whether work was at such an early stage that assigning milestones was done in a vacuum, over-optimistically.
  • Whether we know enough to assign a new milestone target date now.
  • Whether we can arrive at a new target date that fits within our two-year window.

• Possible actions regarding milestone list:
  • Remove from milestone list (with continued WG interest)
  • Retarget document to a later date, if one can be arrived at
pNFS RDMA Layout
Other Actions to Consider

• Look at other ways to get progress in this area:
  • Is there interest in a more general document in this area, such as a requirements document?
  • Could additional authors help make progress?
  • Are there useful ways to encourage further prototyping?

• May need to have further working group discussion of this area:
  • Need to assess level of working group interest.
  • Discussion of our options regarding work on this layout type.
  • Might require something beyond email discussion, either at IETF 103, an interim meeting, or a conference call.