

IntArea WG Agenda

IETF 111 - Virtual
Friday, July 30, 2021

16:00-18:00 Friday Session III (PST)

Chairs:
Juan Carlos Zuniga (SIGFOX)
Wassim Haddad (Ericsson)

Minute taker (based on recording): Luigi Iannone

1. Agenda Bashing, WG & Document Status Updates (Chairs)

5 minutes

- Update on <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-intarea-gue/>
 - Document has not been revised according to review of Eric Vyncke (AD).

- Unless authors revise accordingly this document will just die and resurrection of the document means the need to go through WG adoption again.

2. MADINAS BoF update, Juan Carlos Zuniga

5 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-zuniga-mac-address-randomization/>
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-henry-madinas-framework/>

- BoF was successful showing support from the community to write informational documents (at least at the beginning)
- It will be discussed next week by the IAB and IESG.
- Eric Vyncke (AD) positive for WG chartering.

3. Tactile Internet Application Requirements, Chathura Sarathchandra

30 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-sarathchandra-tactile-internet>

- Document will change terminology from "service requirements" to "application requirements" to avoid confusion and ambiguity.
- Q&A
 - From the jabber and also question it looks like the 1ms requirement looks too strict since humans are in the loop and they are not so fast.
 - Authors state this depends a bit on the specific use case.
 - On the flip side, if 1ms is a requirement is the Internet the right technology for that?
 - Authors are looking to answer this question with the help of the IETF community.
 - What is needed for what is in the document is high throughput, low latency, high reliability. Is there a solution to get there?
 - Authors do not have definite answer to the question. They suggest start tackling the various requirements. But, there is also the modality of communication (e.g., haptic communication) should the network handle the traffic of those communication differently?
 - Solution is needed because other SDos like IEEE with their TSN solution are progressing and able to handle traffic like in this use case.

4. Functional Addressing (FA) for internets with Independent Network Address Spaces (IINAS), Toerless Eckert

15 mins

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-eckert-intarea-functional-addr-internets/>

- No specific request/conclusion from the presenter.
- Q&A
 - In the proposed encoding looks like even links need to have an address/identifier does this make the address longer?
 - We have now path identifiers that encode the exit links which are locally defined and at each step part of the path identifier is trimmed.
 - Is this applicable to the whole Internet or just inside limited domains?
 - Is difficult to deploy new solution in the Internet, we had several failures in the past (e.g., DiffServ, Multicast) but they exist in limited domains and this is how also this technology will start.
 - There are a lot of discussions in IPv6 about extension headers, which are variable length and very hard to deal with. Now you propose variable length addresses, isn't there a conflict?
 - True, but the proposed solution tries to simplify the situation. We can learn from MPLS (MPLS community claims much more can be done). This mechanism is based on longest prefix lookup trim and forward. It is simple. Agreed that more in-depth discussion should take place to better compare the forwarding plane processing complexity of fixed length addresses and variable length path identifiers.

5. Problems and Requirements of Satellite Constellation for Internet, Lin Han

15 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-lhan-problems-requirements-satellite-net/>

- Authors demand for comments and feedback on the document.
- Q&A
 - Are the plans to solve this problem at layer 3? Because the problem has been around since the 90s and solved at Layer 2.
 - Authors do not have a specific solution yet. They want to raise awareness about the problem. Authors claim that is not the same problem as in the 90s because the scale of the LEO solution is different with higher number of satellites and higher number of ground stations.
 - May be routing is not really needed because satellites have a strict schedule so path can be planned in advance. In case of failure and SDN approach can make the deal.
 - Authors believe that liveness of links is more fragile due for instance to weather conditions so a solution is most likely needed.

6. Challenging Scenarios and Problems in Internet Addressing, Yihao Jia

7. Gap analysis in Internet Addressing, Yihao, Jia

20 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-jia-intarea-scenarios-problems-addressing/>
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-jia-intarea-internet-addressing-gap-analys>

- Authors are looking for feedback on the documents are inviting even for new co-authors. Discussion to continue on the mailing list.

8. Requirements and Scenarios for Industry Internet Addressing, Kiran Makhijani

10 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-km-industrial-internet-requirements/>

- Authors invite for feedback and contributors. IOTOPS possible place to continue the discussion and develop the address framework.

9. Transmission of IP Packets over Overlay Multilink Network (OMNI) Interfaces, Fred Templin

20 minutes

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-templin-6man-omni/>

- Authors asking for WG adoption.
- Chairs: we need more support for the document. Bring it to the list.
-