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
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