

Routing Area Open Meeting

IETF 103 – Bangkok

Deborah Brungard (db3546@att.com)

Alvaro Retana (alvaro.retana@huawei.com)

Martin Vigoureux (martin.vigoureux@nokia.com)

Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- [BCP 9](#) (Internet Standards Process)
- [BCP 25](#) (Working Group processes)
- [BCP 25](#) (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- [BCP 54](#) (Code of Conduct)
- [BCP 78](#) (Copyright)
- [BCP 79](#) (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

Note Also...

- Please state your name clearly before speaking at the microphone
- Audio streams and jabber
 - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/103/agenda/>
 - xmpp:rtgarea@jabber.ietf.org
- Routing Area mailing list
 - routing-discussion@ietf.org
- Routing Area wiki
 - <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/rtg/trac/wiki/WikiStart>
- Routing Directorate
 - <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/rtg/trac/wiki/RtgDir>
- Blue Sheets
 - Are now scanned and published

Agenda

- Administrivia
 - Area Status
 - rtg-dir Report
- DC Routing Update - Status and Technology Updates
 - Link State Vector Routing (lsvr)
 - Routing In Fat Trees (rift)
- Open Discussion / Any other business

Document Review Request

Document quality relies on reviews, please make an effort to review documents in your working group and at least one other document from another working group.

If you'd like documents you care about reviewed, put the effort in to review other documents.

Please!

Requirement Levels Language

In many IETF documents, several words, when they are in all capitals as shown below, are used to signify the requirements in the specification. These capitalized words can bring significant clarity and consistency to documents because their meanings are well defined. This document defines how those words are interpreted in IETF documents when the words are in all capitals.

- o These words can be used as defined here, but using them is not required. Specifically, normative text does not require the use of these key words. They are used for clarity and consistency when that is what's wanted, but a lot of normative text does not use them and is still normative.
- o The words have the meanings specified herein only when they are in all capitals.
- o When these words are not capitalized, they have their normal English meanings and are not affected by this document.

Authors who follow these guidelines should incorporate this phrase near the beginning of their document:

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

Feedback to ADs

- How are we doing?
- How can we do things better?
- What's broken with the area?
- What's working with the area?

Area Status

- WG Status Changes
 - Closed: 1 (sidr)
 - Re-chartered: 1 (spring)
 - New: 0

WG Distribution

Alvaro

- bier
- idr
- lsr
- lsvr
- manet
- pim
- rift
- roll

Deborah

- ccamp
- detnet
- lisp
- mpls
- pals
- pce
- teas

Martin

- babel
- bess
- bfd
- i2rs
- nvo3
- rtgwg
- sfc
- spring

WG Status Updates

- We are shifting the focus of the summaries to address an “external” audience: the people who may not be participating in the WG and want a quick summary of what’s going on; IETF participants familiar with the datatracker, but not involved in the WG would be part of this audience.
- Experimenting with “Status Update” field in each WG datatracker page:
 - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/group/xxx/about/status/edit/>
- Guidelines:
 - Provide current and relevant information so that the external audience can get a quick snapshot.
 - Narrative description – minimize the use of bullets.
 - At least include:
 - A general/static introduction to what the WG does. No more than a couple of sentences.
 - A dynamic description of work that is currently interesting or being actively discussed...
 - A tag indicating the date of the last update.
 - Update the status at least 3 times per year — more often is perfectly fine too.

<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/rtg/wiki/IETF103summary>

Implementation Requirement Policy

- Request to the Chairs to consider an Implementation Requirement Policy (IRP) for their WG.
- This request doesn't mean that we expect all RTG WGs to require implementations and implementation reports. Perfectly valid IRPs include, but are not limited to:
 - require at least 2 interoperable implementations and detailed implementation reports
 - require x implementations documented in an Implementation Status Section (rfc7942)
 - require x implementations — no specific documentation needed
 - require x implementations, but the Chairs can make exceptions per-document
 - document known implementations in the Implementation Status Section (rfc7942)
 - the Chairs will ask about implementations
 - no requirement

RTG-DIR REPORT

DC ROUTING UPDATE

OPEN DISCUSSION