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Main motivation is using inclusive language – Replace “Master” with “Active”.

Also fixing Errata

Hoping for some good reviews as well.

Will investigate taking VRRPv3 to Internet Standard.

Probably not feasible unless draft updates implemented quickly.
VRRP – Other RFCs (1/3)

- RFC 6527 - Definitions of Managed Objects for Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol Version 3 (VRRPv3)
  - No firm plans yet – Cisco has implementation(s) though.
  - 2 of 3 MIB tables and 1 of 2 notifications need to be deprecated and replaced with new tables.
  - MIB respins are painful and MIBs are IETF legacy.
VRRP – Other RFCs (2/3)

- RFC 7910 - Interoperability between the Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol and PIM
  - No plans yet – Informational draft. Will check with author about simple respin once RFC 5798 further along.
VRRP – Other RFCs (3/3)

- RFC 8347 - A YANG Data Model for the Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol (VRRP)
  - Acee is co-author. Intend to respin once RFC 5798 BIS is further along.
  - No known implementations
  - YANG model respins are also painful but YANG is where the IETF has gone.
  - Experience with RFC 8022 -> RFC 8349 (Transition to NDMA version of Routing Management YANG Model)
Next Steps

• Agree Routing WG is home for draft and any other VRRP BIS drafts updating terminology.

• Possible discussion on VRRP terminology change:
  • Authors agree that “Active” is the natural choice in the context of VRRP state and technical terminology.
  • Please don’t make alternate suggestions without detailed knowledge of both the VRRP protocol and the English Language.

• Request WG Adoption
Thank you