

AD Comments on performance measurement with the marking method in BIER

draft-ietf-bier-pmmm-oam

IETF-105 July 2019, Montreal

Acted on comments

Number of Alvaro's comments lead to updates to the draft. The WG should discuss these comments and the related changes:

- Moved RFC 8321 to the Normative References list
- Terminology: use “marking method” vs. PNPM (Packet Network Performance Monitoring)
- Dynamically managing Monitoring Points in BIER – adding/removing
- Added Operational Considerations section
 - Can we recommend specific values for the duration of a colored block (time or packet number)?
- Re-worked Security Considerations section
 - Integrity protection?

Open questions

- Track: Experimental, Informational, or Standard?
 - RFC 8321 is Experimental. Alvaro has pointed that “given that rfc8321 is not mature enough, what should be the Status of this document: Experimental or Informational?”
- Relationship to draft-ietf-bier-oam-requirements:
 - Added reference is the right step but not enough
 - If WG is resolute to publish draft-ietf-bier-oam-requirements, it should progress at least in-step with this draft
- Using the OAM field for Marking Method
 - Could there be other interpretations and use of the OAM field of BIER header or only for the Alt.Marking method?
 - If the interpretation of the OAM field is only as defined in this draft, then it must be marked as update of RFC 8296.
 - In any case, IANA Considerations section doesn't make sense - remove
 - Naming flags:
 - L(oss)/D(elay) vs. S(ingle)/D(ouble)

Next Steps

- Discuss, decide
- Address comments
- WG LC II

Thank you