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Goals of the draft:

- discuss the different options proposed in draft-ietf-l3vpn-2547bis-mcast
- identify the better candidates for a set of mandatory procedures, to produce a standard candidate

In scope:

- solutions specified in draft-ietf-l3vpn-2547bis
- requirements expressed in RFC 4834

About past releases:

- First submission in March 2007 (Prague)
- Good support to the draft expressed by the WG in Vancouver
- Some comments on the mailing list challenging the draft
- Revisions -02 and -03 to improve the document with respects to these comments
A new contributor joined: Nabil Bitar / Verizon
This revision focused on improving the draft to address comments made by Eric Rosen
Overview of changes:
- Development of rationale and comparisons, all along the draft
  - Among other things: add a quantified comparison for PE-PE signaling scalability with an increased amount of PEs per VPN
- Remove some content that was not key to draw conclusions
- Many editorial changes
Key Recommendations
- a. make BGP-based auto-discovery be MANDATORY
- b. make BGP be the mandated solution for S-PMSI switching signaling
- c. support both the BGP-based and PIM-based solutions for PE-PE C-multicast routing until further operational experience is gained with both solutions
- d. that implementations support the segmented inter-AS tunnels approach
- e. for P-tunnels, suggest to implement the P2MP variants of the P2P tunneling protocols that they already implement, such as mLDP, P2MP RSVP-TE and GRE/IP-Multicast

Other recommendations
- suggest that it can be useful to provide the alternatives to (b) and (d) above, to facilitate
Does the draft fit the working group goals?  
- Yes, it would push us closer to being able to progress mvnpn specs to the IESG  
- About the “profile” approach  
  ➔ it has not been shown that having a set of mandatory procedures would be limiting for some deployments  
  ➔ only producing “profiles” would not match the WG goals  
    - Charter: “Submit specification of multicast over BGP/MPLS VPNs”  
    - Singular! (this is just what a standard organization usually strives to do)

Does this draft close the way for other alternatives that can be needed?  
- No, alternatives in draft-ietf-2547bis-mcast would still remain as OPTIONAL  
  ➔ that includes the approaches similar to existing deployments  
- New work should progress as its own pace, and go through WG adoption before it can be decided that waiting for it is worth delaying progress of documents already adopted

Are the recommendations agreed upon and properly supported?  
- Good support expressed in Vancouver  
  ➔ (the few people vocal against the content of the document are the one opposing the goal of the document)  
- Improved rationale for the conclusions was added in recent revisions  
- WG adoption is not the “final cut” for a draft  
- Up to the working group to decide
Working group adoption ?