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Last Call #1 - Comments & Responses
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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 \(\rightarrow\) Peering Point \(\rightarrow\) 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: “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.