

LMAP

Juergen remote

Dan – WG status summary

Dan – we heard nothing from the other protocol draft-liu-lmap-rest

Vic Liu – we're discussing with Juergen and hope can be merged

Dan – make your suggestions as mods to the restconf wg draft

Registry updates – AI

-----

As a result of the interim. Doc now in ippm wg lc

Registry multiple screens wide, so url to a more (human) readable format

Data format for both run-time and fixed parameters

One kind of output statistic per registry entry

Draft on example of registry entries – feedback from interim

UDP RTT now updated with many clarifications

Use case for machine readable sections of registry (although target audience is human)

Maybe single column with all info for machines

Juergen – waiting for concrete proposal before he comments on this

What kind of situation – are MA all on same device?

Tim – machine readable – controllers need to talk same language

Communication between controllers is not in scope

AI – is in scope of ippm registry definition

AI – binary data format may be useful

Marcelo – machine readable – requires a lot of work

Dan – next step – one example of machine readable from people who are interested

Info model – juergen

-----

Tim – looked at suppression change. Concerns: lost concept of suppressing a subset of schedules

Juergen – suppress actions or schedule and action refers to this

Info model – no relationship to schedule?

Time out for conn with controller raises an event

Various requests to Tim to check whether now deals with issues he raised

Tim – I haven't distinguished between config & preconfig in BBF data model – so I agree with Juergen. It's up to controller to know which it is.

Tim – draft can say what controller needs to do at startup, but not make a first class object with formal data structure. People seem happy

Juergen – hard to report multiple metrics from a single task. Eg raw data and median of data

Needs to be more flexible

Results always include parameters and options – instead reference via a tag to reduce reporting overhead

Robert – we (RIPE ATLAS) used to use csv, moved away because not flexible for things like traceroute with complex results – moved to json

Tim – BBF data model – encoding [csv /json /xml] is characteristic of the reporting channel, depending on what the collector can do. So formatting not forced onto Imap. What protocol, how back off etc. let report be the report.

Juergen – structure of report – results rows & columns. Is this enough or do we need hierarchy structure. This isn't an encoding issue

Robert – flat isn't flexible enough eg squeezing in mpls info is really hard

Juergen – go with grid like but allow plug in of structure?

Tim – no, easier to go from structure to grid than the other way round

Juergen – problem is that structure is specific to the test – how do we do this? Ideas??

Juergen – I will split report metadata from results themselves

Robert – value in redundancy and use compression. Value in not having to look up tag etc

Discussion – do we want to optimise – remember what metadata already reported to what collector

So leave as out of scope – let compression do it?

Dan – will have interim mid Jan.

Data model

-----

Rpc operation – which is restconf equivalent of http post that a couple of actual systems use

Align with info model changes

Tim – logging – I rely on the external stuff

Juergen – will refer logging out

Dan – does anyone want something lmap specific for logging otherwise rely on syslog or whatever?

Tim – BBF TR304 – measurement points in fixed line world is robust. String is format? Is this good enough?

Juergen – supporting ippm reference path

Al - yes, string is sufficient for the RFC on measurement point – of format “mp100”

Using restconf

-----

Waiting for reviews on info /data /protocol – all inter dependent

Dan – thanks to meetecho for good remote experience

New draft – Sarvesh & John

Based on comcast /villanova work for measuring ipv6 deployment

Making sure probe could run on small form factor devices

Local collectors – because volume of data

Different ways of pulling raw data into analysis system

Dynamically add modules with new tests

Geographical map visualisation with overlay

Mike ackerman – v4 vs v6?

Purpose was to find issues with v6 eg in service providers

Into customer kit or at modem? Intention is to put into customer premise

Dan – are you presenting to ippm? No

We’re looking at possibly making some of the software open source

Alissa – things going very well. John – would be interesting to understand comparison with lmap data model and protocol.

John – authorise probe to send data. Transport level encryption. Can talk about data models we use.

Sarvesh – scalability meant we thought about things very carefully

Dan – there’ll be a virtual interim. And maybe a 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Future work – we can make room in meetings for some discussion. Re-chartering when info and data model go to iesg