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Goals of the draft:
- discuss the different options proposed in draft-ietf-l3vpn-2547bis-mcast in the lights of requirements formulated in RF4834
- identify the better candidates for a core set of mandatory mVPN procedures, to produce a good standard candidate

Draft -00 submitted one year ago for Prague
Draft -01 submitted in October
- Vancouver showed good support from the working group to adopt as a WG item
- some comments on the mailing list ➔ extensive discussion in December/January

Draft -02 submitted for this meeting
Goal of this update was to cover the comments made since -01
  * in each case we tried to improve the content of the document and address all the issues raised
  * some comments were less relevant, or where beyond the scope of the document => was explained on the mailing list

Overview of changes
  * new subjects are tackled, notably to help distinguish the PIM-based and the BGP-based approaches for C-multicast routing
  * new arguments were incorporated into the discussions on issues already partially covered
  * document structure was modified to improve readability, and being systematic in the comparisons
New subjects

- impact of the customer multicast routing dynamic nature on the different approaches for C-multicast routing
- impact on the group-join-latency of the different approaches for C-multicast routing
- implication on hardware of aggregation of multiple VPNs inside a tunnel

Improved content for...

- implications of the different C-multicast routing approaches on the control plane processing load, in higher scale scenarios
- improved wording wrt. to RP outsourcing
  - clear up confusion: OPTIONNÁL feature, MUST not be required to activate
  - distinguish between RP function: PIM RP procedures, MSDP/anycast RP procedures

Many editorial changes
Lengthy comments recently made by Eric Rosen
- 3 days ago => will be addressed, but not today

Yet, some early comments
- Some valid points
  -> the document may deserve being more focused, some arguments are of lesser interest to the key discussion
  -> technical explanations can be improved
- Some misleading points (we feel)
  -> very debatable at the minimum
  -> will be discussed on the mailing list
- Some surprises...
  -> new comments on previous content, why not earlier ?
  -> some comments are repetitions of comments made in December, which we had addressed on the mailing list asking for clarification (without success)
  -> Eric seem to go back and challenge conclusion he seemed to agree to 3 month ago
  -> Volume / delay effect?
Next steps

- Keep the goal in mind
  - draft-l3vpn-2547bis-mcast needs a core set of mandatory procedures
- Next revision (and mailing list discussion) will address the comments made and their implications
  - Contributions are welcome!
- Next revision for adoption as WG doc?