IETF CASM BOF

March 27th 2017

Chairs:
Marc Blanchet, mailto:marc.blanchet@viagenie.ca
Ralph Droms, mailto:rdroms.ietf@gmail.com
Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

-the IETF plenary session,
-any IETF working group or portion thereof,
-the IESG or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
-the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
-any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
-the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 3978 (updated by RFC 4748) and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 3978 (and RFC 4748) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
Proposed Agenda

- Administrativia
- Use cases and requirements:
  - draft-kumar-casm-problem-and-use-cases, draft-kumar-casm-requirements-and-framework
  - draft-xie-ps-centralized-address-management
- Architecture/Framework:
  - draft-kumar-casm-requirements-and-framework (last part)
  - draft-li-casm-address-pool-management-arch
- Discussion
- Next steps
Administrativia

- Jabber room: casm@jabber.ietf.org
- Note Takers?
• RFC 5434:
  – there is a problem that needs solving, and the IETF is the right group to attempt solving it.
  – there is a critical mass of participants willing to work on the problem (e.g., write drafts, review drafts, etc.).
  – the scope of the problem is well defined and understood, that is, people generally understand what the WG will work on (and what it won't) and what its actual deliverables will be.
  – there is agreement that the specific deliverables (i.e., proposed documents) are the right set.
  – it is believed that the WG has a reasonable probability of having success (i.e., in completing the deliverables in its charter in a timely fashion).
Some Specific Questions

- Which interfaces does CASM plan on standardizing?
- Which lines in the diagram get an interface?
- Borders? (customers/enterprises/within org/tenants/...)?
- What is the goal of interoperability?
- What are the envisioned key deliverables?