

IDR session 2, IETF-109

- WG status sent via email today
 - Looking for BGP-LS reviewers for 4 documents
 - Adoption request from IETF 109 – please send email to chairs so we can confirm requests
 - Let us know if we missed something
- BGP Yang model
 - Received Comments from Yang Doctors
 - Ready to go at last?

IDR Efforts

- Flow Specification
 - 5575bis, Flowspec v6, both close to publication but continuing to pick final nits
 - Flow Specification version 2 – Time for work to begin
- IP-Sec related tunnel types
- BGP-LS Streamlining
 - BGP-LS for BGP-only – starting work
 - BGP-LS registry draft – Need input
- Autoconf work stalled – Chairs will restart
- Route Leak protection: Grow/IDR

IP-Sec related Tunnel Types

- 3 potential tunnel types for 3 different use cases
 - 2 in IDR
 - 1 in BESS
- Goals
 - Shared SubTLVs if same information
 - Reviewed by Security Area and/or Security Directorate
 - Based on draft-ietf-idr-tunnel-encaps
 - Clear specifications
- Non-Goal
 - Forcing 3 different use cases into one tunnel type

BGP-LS Registries

- Created by RFC 7752
 - All registries totally or partially governed as
Expert review with approval by Designated Expert
 - Guidance to DE
existence of suitable documentation (a specification) as described in [RFC5226] and to verify that the document is permanently and publicly available
- Debate rages over whether an Internet-Draft qualifies
 - Is an individual draft different from a WG draft?
 - Does the tools.ietf.org archive count as permanently available?
 - Does an I-D that can be updated and changed count as a stable reference?
- Avoid this debate in IDR!
 - Option 1: Move registries to “Expert review” allowing DE to process requests
 - Desire Internet-Drafts for all IETF-originated requests
 - This is draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-registries
 - Option 2: Retain “Specification Required” but refine DE guidance
 - We could explicitly tell the DEs to accept I-Ds
 - We would be hiding from the debate around what RFC 5226 actually means
- Action?
 - Back to the WG to say what it really wants
 - Note that draft-ietf-idr-rfc7752bis is now well advanced

Autoconf Design Team

- Design team appears stalled
 - This is, ultimately, the chairs' responsibility of course
- One final push to complete deliverable by next meeting
 - Chairs will be actively involved
 - Author meeting dates (please send feedback)
 - December 8 and 15

Acknowledgements

- Many thanks to Jie Dong for (among other things) all his work creating our agenda and organizing our speakers.