SPRING

IETF 103 Bangkok, Thailand - November 2018

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.

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.

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)

Minutes & Jabber

- We need a minute taker and a scribe...
- Minutes can be collaborative:
 - Etherpad http://etherpad.tools.ietf.org:9000/p/notes-ietf-103-spring?useMonospaceFont=true

Charter Update

- We are now rechartered.
 - See page at https://tools.ietf.org/wg/spring
- Preference will be given to drafts that address charter items.

Implementation Requirement Policy

Discussed at IETF 102 plenary, then by IESG

→ Should be defined on a WG by WG basis

Examples of policies:

- 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

Implementation Requirement Policy (2)

No time in the agenda today. Chairs will initiate a thread on the mailing list.

SPRING is specific as most protocol extensions are done in their own WG.

Chairs a priori considering:

document known implementations in the Implementation Status Section (rfc7942)

RFC 2119 Key Words (MAY, SHOULD, MUST...)

RFC 8174 has updated RFC 2119 since May 2017

IESG still see many documents not updated as per RFC 8174.

You SHOULD update your draft SOON to:

- Reference RFC8174
- Update the boiler plate to

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 <u>BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174]</u> when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

Agenda

- Again, we had more requests than we had time for.
- Preference is given to working group items, and subsequently drafts that have been discussed on the list.
 - We're not discussing WG drafts today.
- Aim to accommodate presentations that over-flowed last time.

1.	WG Status / Administrativia Chairs 10'		8.	draft-hedge-mpls-spring-epe-oam Shraddha 7'	
2.	UDP Path for In-Band PM draft-gandhi-spring-udp-pm Rakesh	8'	9.	LSP Ping/Traceroute for SR SIDs with MF draft-nainar-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-sids Zafar	PLS
3.	Performance Measurement in MPLS SR draft-gandhi-spring-sr-mpls-pm Rakesh	7'	10.	NSH and SR Integration for SFC draft-guichard-spring-nsh-sr Jim	5'
4.	Resilient MPLS Rings draft-kompella-spring-rmr Kireeti	10'	11.	BFD for SR Policies draft-ali-spring-bfd-sr-policy Zafar	5'
5.	SR for Enhanced VPN draft-xdong-spring-sr-for-evpn Jie	10'	12.	OAM in SR Networks with IPv6 draft-nainar-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-sids Zafar 5'	
6.	Path Segment in MPLS SR draft-cheng-spring-mpls-path-segment Mach	10'	13.	SR Header Encapsulation for In-Situ OAN draft-ali-spring-ioam-srv6 Zafar	vi 10'
7.	TTL Procedures for SR-TE Paths draft-arora-mpls-spring-ttl-procedures-srte-paths Shraddha	10'	14.	OAM for Service Programming with SR draft-ali-spring-sr-service-programming-oam Zafar	า 10'

Document Status (I)

- draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-central-epe
 - With RFC Ed (MISSREF) → IDR draft for EPE
- draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-ldp-interop
 - With RFC Ed (MISSREF) → SR-MPLS
- draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-mpls
 - Authors addressing comments aim to get back to AD soon!
- draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy
 - Some comments raised on the list.
 - More WG review required.
- draft-ietf-spring-sr-yang
 - YANG Doctors review done.
 - Ready for WGLC post-meeting?

Document Status (II)

- draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-msdc
 - In discussion with IESG -- one DISCUSS to resolve.
 - IESG + AD (Alvaro) discussing.

Working Group Adoption

- BFD drafts.
 - draft-ali-spring-bfd-sr-policy-02 and draft-mirsky-spring-bfd-06
 - Chairs have asked authors to consider merging or at least ensuring consistency.
 - Will issue a call for adoption of the resulting document(s) in SPRING, per agreement with MPLS + BFD chairs.
- Service chaining drafts.
 - o <u>draft-xuclad-spring-sr-service-programming</u> and <u>draft-guichard-spring-nsh-sr</u>.
 - Propose to have a Service Chaining discussion on the list and in Prague to discuss the document(s) the WG would like to progress.

SRv6 & SRH extension

SRH extension is under WGLC in 6MAN WG

- good progression, many comments addressed, some still been discussed
- 6MAN will do another WGLC

SRv6 SRH extensions (e.g., flags, TLV)

- will not be adopted until SRH finished
- then as per SPRING charter, may be defined in either
 - SPRING (functional) & 6MAN (protocol)
 - 6MAN (after chairs agreement)
 - SPRING (after chairs agreement)