

On-Demand Connectivity Verification

draft-ietf-mpls-tp-on-demand-cv

Primary Suspect: Eric Gray (Ericsson)

Co-conspirators: Sami Boutros (Cisco),
Nitin Bahadur and Rahul Aggarwal (Juniper)

Changes/Events Since Last IETF Meeting

- Changes to “fix” code-point assignment fiasco
 - Several drafts had “assumed” certain code point assignments from over-lapping spaces
 - Four drafts had to be “quickly” updated to reflect early IANA allocations
 - (***Plug for everybody to use the early allocation process and use TBD-like notation until code points, etc. are actually allocated***)
 - Incorporate text from *draft-ietf-mpls-tp-lsp-ping-bfd-procedures* that was particularly relevant to this draft, and removed references to that draft
 - Clarified and added text relevant to ACH code-point assigned
 - Added text on *Reverse Path CV* and *GAL Label Processing*
 - Other minor changes consistent with any update to an ID
 - Produced the -02 version with just those changes in February (earlier version published in October)

Changes/Events Since Last IETF Meeting (continued)

- Other changes pushed to -03 version
 - Text clean-up
 - Section 3.2 *On-demand CV with IP encapsulation, over ACH*
 - Section 3.7 *GAL Label Processing*
 - Added figure titles to figures explicitly referred to in other parts of the draft
 - Define new address field format for DSMAP/DDMAP TLVs
 - ***Non-IP***
 - This is an update to RFC 4379 (ID header updated to reflect this)
 - Added IANA considerations sub-section to establish a new registry for address-types used in DSMAP/DDMAP TLVs
 - Called a TLV in error (no length field, this is a set of fields in a DSMAP or DDMAP TLV) – will be fixed after Last Call
 - Define new ***identifier*** TLVs for source and destination
 - New sections/subsections for Source and Destination
 - New IANA considerations sub-section
 - Called *Address* TLVs in error in version -03 – will be fixed after Last Call
 - Removed MEP and MIP Identifier subsection
 - These are not used by this draft

Currently

- In Last Call – ends after the end of this meeting
- Some reviews completed, more needed
- Good comments, mostly resolved (so far)

Next Steps

- Complete Last Call
- Re-spin the draft with (hopefully) minor changes
- Determine if an additional last call is needed
- ?