

P2MP Policy

draft-ietf-pim-p2mp-policy-ping

Authors:

Hooman Bidgoli, Nokia

Daniel Voyer, Bell Canada

Rishabh Parekh, Cisco Systems

Zhaohui Zhang, Juniper



I E T F[®]

Update/Relevant Drafts

[RFC9524 segment routing replication for multipoint service delivery](#)

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

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

[draft-ietf-bess-mvpn-evpn-sr-p2mp-07 \(work in progress\)](#)

[draft-ietf-pce-sr-p2mp-policy-05 \(work in progress, under implementation by multiple vendors\)](#)

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

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.
- SRv6 OAM is in draft pim SR p2mp policy, probably need a separate draft
- 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!