

Use of Multicast Across Inter-Domain Peering Points

Last Call #1 - Comments & Responses

Percy S. Tarapore, AT&T

Robert Sayko, AT&T

Comment Resolution

Yokohama Meeting

- Dale Garder Comments:
 - 1 General Comment & 6 Specific Comments
 - Resolution:
 - Change in Section 1 on applicability of AMT being restricted to Use Cases 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 accepted.
 - Change in Section 3.1 – Proposed changes and supplied text related to policy and filtering accepted
 - Change in Section 5 – Proposed text for “Looking Glass” style router proxy to facilitate debugging accepted
 - Change in Section 6 – Proposed change related to use of BCP-38 style filtering accepted

Comment Resolution Yokohama Meeting

- Lenny Giuliano Comments:
 - 2 General Comments and 2 Specific Comments
 - Resolution:
 - Authors expressed disagreement and provided extended arguments in support of their reasoning
 - No changes were agreed to

Draft BCP Version 01

- Dale Garder Changes incorporated into this version
- Version 01 of Draft BCP Uploaded on January 21, 2016
- Request for Last Call made on MBONE Email List
- Two Comments Received over Email List:
 - Lenny Giuliano:
 - Last Call cannot be initiated as all of his original comments were not discussed on the MBONE mailing list
 - On Back-Office Functions: Agreed to Disagree
 - Requested Feedback on 2 Other Comments
 - Tim Chown

Lenny Giuliano's Comments

- Comment 1:
 - Section 1 (Assumptions): Focus on Use of SSM as Protocol
 - Draft Text provided by Lenny for this purpose
 - Resolution: Authors accepted Draft Text provided by Lenny
- Comment 2:
 - Expressed Concern that Use Cases 3.3., 3.4, & 3.5 may not be necessary
 - Offer from Lenny: “We May Agree to Disagree on This”!!

Lenny Giuliano's Comment 2

Resolution

- Author's Response:
 - Assumption has always been that AD-1 is Native Multicast Enabled and there exists a Previously Established Peering Point Between AD-1 & AD-2.
 - Five Use Cases Possible as Follows:
- Use Case 1: Native e2e (AD-1 \rightleftharpoons Peering Point \rightleftharpoons AD-2)
- Both AD's Multicast Enabled but Peering Point Not Multicast Enabled:
 - Use Case 2: Configure GRE Tunnel over Peering Point solely for purpose of Multicast Delivery between AD's
 - Use Case 3: Same as 2; Except configure AMT over Peering Point

Lenny Giuliano's Comment Resolution (continued)

- AD-2 & Peering Point Not Multicast Enabled:
 - Use Case 4: Establish Multiple AMTs between AMT Relay in AD-1 and EU GW in AD-2. This is not very efficient for bandwidth use, especially if there are many End Users
 - Use Case 5: Configure Concatenated AMTs from AMT Relay in AD-1 to Strategically Located AMT Gateways in AD-2. Better Efficiency in bandwidth use & can support many End Users.
- New Assumption added to Section 1 ii *“Administrative Domain 1 (AD-1) is enabled with native multicast. A peering point exists between AD-1 and AD-2.”*
- Authors take up Lenny's Offer: We Agree to Disagree.
We Currently have ALL FIVE Configurations Running in our Networks!!

Tim Chown Comments

- Suggestion to focus on SSM as protocol use - Supports Lenny's Proposed Text Change.
 - Resolution: See Lenny's Comment
- Generally Supportive of BCP
- No Major Resolution Necessary

Draft BCP Version 02

- SSM Protocol change in Section 1 per Lenny's Draft Text
- Assumption Added in Section 1 (see Slide 7)
- Some cleanup/edits
- Uploaded on March 21, 2016

- Request Last Call for Version 02 at this Meeting.