P2MP Policy
draft-ietf-pim-p2mp-policy-ping

Authors:

Hooman Bidgoli, Nokia
Daniel Voyer, Bell Canada
Rishabh Parekh, Cisco Systems
Zhaohui Zhang, Juniper

Update/Relevant Drafts

draft-spring-sr-replication-segment-19 (going for RFC, added SRv6)

draft-ietf-pim-sr-p2mp-policy-07 (Last call soon, added SRv6)

draft-hb-spring-sr-p2mp-policy-yang-02 (need to revive it)

draft-ietf-bess-mvpn-evpn-sr-p2mp-07 (work in progress)

draft-ietf-pce-sr-p2mp-policy-01 (work in progress, under implementation by multiple vendors)

draft-ietf-idr-sr-p2mp-policy-04 (draft now, need to progress the work here)

draft-ietf-pim-p2mp-policy-ping-04 (we have a implementation now, asking for last call)

Update

- Nokia has an implementation as per draft version 4 now
- IANA assigned `41: P2MP Policy MPLS Candidate Path from TLV type 1 (Target FEC Stack) from the "Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) Ping Parameters" registry, "TLVs and sub-TLVs" sub-registry.`
- Security section has been updated
  - Security considerations same as RFC8029
  - P2MP policy ping is susceptible to the same tree attack vectors explained in RFC8029 section 5
  - Same procedures and RECOMMENDATIONS as RFC8029

Next Steps

- Asked the MPLS WG for comments. Nothing heard.
- Requesting last call to trigger comment and wrap up the draft.

Thank you!