

agenda@13:59, no objections

wg items:

- alvaro: igmp-mld-yang has outstanding yang doctor problem, ready to move on when resolved. Yang doesn't have to be experimental even if referenced draft is experimental. Standards track is ok.
- pim-msdp-yang, no objections to leaving it standards track instead of experimental, in spite of msdp experimental
- manka: pim-drlb doing iana considerations update, then moving on
- jake: would be nice to have an implementations section required, even if no known implementations are required.

stig - pim-igmp-yang-model

- status update

carlos - draft-ietf-pim-multiple-upstreams-reqs

- jake: consider cluster or merge; requirements doc without solution is fragile and useless
- mike: anyone interested in helping implement?
- jake: i would test
- hitoshi: it's complicated. support progressing and clarifying requirements doc + clarifying requirements may be lighter task.
- stig: does the existing draft include enough detail to understand the issues? - dunno
- alvaro: since passing wglc already, expected more than 2 to read. not enough interest.
- can't support publish publication in iesg stream.
- kick doc back to wg, moved to independent stream
- stig: way forward=work on solution along with doc. wg can do them together.
- alvaro as individual: prefer do it in 1, not 2 docs.
- stig: current solution under discussion: draft-asaeda-pim-multiif-igmpmldproxy-02

hongji - draft-ietf-pim-igmp-mld-snooping-yang

- ask wg: prefer name snooping-groups or snooping-caches?
- also ask for wglc
- (no consensus calls yet?)

hongji = draft-zhao-pim-igmp-mld-proxy-yang

- toerless: how does the igmp on upstream impact the config? (if igmp proxying switches off pim, does this need to be reflected in pim model?)
- is there a way across models to express "disable pim"?
- hongji: have not considered pim, will ask for comments after meeting
- stig: 1 has read doc, need more to read before adopting.
- stig: are you trying to make mld and igmp proxying models similar, and is there any overlap?

sandy - draft-ietf-pim-dr-improvement

- mike: is manka's draft a competing solution or what?
- manka: i don't see it as a competing solution, just a different way
- stig: i think the main diff is that sandy's draft supports a stickyness that the more basic solution

- hitoshi: new solution should perhaps be folded into existing draft
 - manka: yes, that's why we asked wg last ietf.
 - sandy: this has been implemented and we believe it's mature
 - manka: both can coexist, no reason not to move forward
 - Jake its ready for wglc.
- 4 people think its ready for wglc. 4 people read it.

stig - draft-venaas-bier-pfm-sd

- come to bier, see pfm. might get some tlvs

stig - Progressing IGMPv3/MLDv2 on the standards track

- toerless: montreal had 2 options: 1. don't modify, 2. (as pim did) based on what wasn't used, reflow (e.g. exclude non-empty list of sources, not being used, unknown how it works)
- stig: knows at least one case using excluded, but would be interested to know how widely it's used
- stig: sent out survey everywhere they could, for pim bis to make standard. want to reach as many as possible and find out what they're using.
- alvaro: bcp9, rfc 6410 is the standards process, describes what's needed to achieve this.
- stig:
 - good idea? 6 hands
 - against? no hands
- mike: takes time, but not too onerous
- stig: get different vendors involved. need volunteers.
- jake: is there a conformance test suite that can check what vendors did, rather than asking them?
- stig: there's commercial stuff, would be nice to have open source.
- hitoshi: for pim was a long process but worth it.
- stig: will try to reach out on mailing list, find someone from each vendor. let's try to make progress before next ietf.

hitoshi (added to agenda, with extra time) - draft-asaeda-pim-multif-igmpmldproxy

- paused because waiting for requirements draft, but in light of comments today maybe better to proceed
- jake: rpf might be a helpful addition, when some of interfaces have private space. (not so much for global)
- also mtrace to filter for reachability, at least?
- hitoshi: it's complicated
- toerless: (confusing conversation here) - rpf is good way to think of it
- jeffrey: is this informational or standard?
- hitoshi: if rfc4605bis, it should be standard. else not sure.
- jeffrey: could reasonably be local implementation, doesn't have to be standard.
- toerless: sort of (?) [notes: missed some of this.]
- alvaro: questions about what's the intent

ian - Multicast Within SR-MPLS A Comparative Review

- greg: 3-5.5x cost for bier is not logic cost in chip, it's comparison between chips that don't currently support bier natively, running anyway
- Hooman: should it be in spring?
- stig+mike: multicast is in-charter. was announced on spring list that ian is coming here.
- ian: iesg sent this here.
- hit the nail on the head: unicast network segment routing to get rid of legacy, "now what about multicast?" follows quickly. don't see why spray (i think?) . trying to echo the reasoning on slide, operators want to just stick mld on instead of ??
[notetaker is totally lost here, plz review video...]
- toerless: shouldn't look at early power measurements to infer long-term expected differences/costs. next gen chips will be designed with the use case in mind, and have very different performance properties.
[notes lost while disconnected from etherpad with server error]