

PIM WG:

Agenda bashing.

pim-yang draft publication requested in march
new proposal for new yang confirmation states. should pim model be updated to follow that? need to discuss with our AD. AD: depends if other models will be updated to use that.

pim-source-discovery-bsr draft in publication req queue

pim-explicit-tracking draft which has been dead need to make progress
Hitoshi: changed from proposed standard to experimental. some guidelines in the doc should be changed. next meeting will present update on draft.

pim-drlb. Alia had comments and it kind of died. new revision. do another last call. see if there is interest and discuss changes and do another last call.

pim-dr-improvement draft. no update now. will discuss in Singapore.

Carlos: pim-multiple-upstream-reqs
have not updated draft for awhile.
purpose to define the functionality that igmp/mld proxy with multiple upstream interfaces should have in order to support different scenarios of applicability in both fixed and mobile networks.
-problem statement and scenarios of applicability
multicast wholesale offer for residential services
multicast resiliency
load balancing for multicast traffic in the metro segment
network merging with different multicast services
tried to define requirements and impact for multiple upstream interfaces for the proxy using the various scenarios.
Documents history and next steps
adopted after ietf 92
some initial security considerations added in -01.
version -02 and -03 includes two new applicability scenarios
addressed latest comments
how many people have read this draft 6
how many people feel it's ready for last call? 8 yes. zero no's.

Yisong: pim-igmp-mld-yang.
version 4
reviewed by wg chair
updated according to the review comments. reviewed by yang doctor.
passed validation
updating description for 3 configuration levels.
global level: igmp/mld attributes for entire working system not working on interfaces only
interface global: no configuration. not easy to explain.
interface-level
other updating information:
some common parameters both for igmp and mld. adding the description for MLD.
protocol version is different. moved from common parameter to separate definition.
Apply to WGLC
Any more comments?

Stig: been a couple of presentations dealing with new yang configuration format. Is the plan to update all the yang models to support that. should we spend time updating this to match other drafts.

Alvaro: there was a statement about how the drafts should be published with respect to different states. IT suggests all models should be updated to format. It does mention that where models have been deployed it doesn't need to be updated. It should have gone to the whole routing area. Alvaro will send to pim wg (he did). If routing area interfaces need to be updated that will need to happen first.

Stig: is the draft ready for wglc? 6 yes. 0 nos.

Alvaro will check if config model changes are needed.

Yisong: pim-igmp-mld-snooping-yang model
First time giving this presentation version 01
structure according to igmp 7 mld model we have reached a new agreement about the whole structure just now. the draft needs an update.
defining a fully functional schema for igmp snooping profile
mld snooping profile is the same as IGMP snooping except changing ipv4 addresses to ipv4r addresses.

prepared to work with other models by profile references

pros:

- can be fully independently defined

- can be augmented

- easy references to and from other modules

- IGMP snooping RPC. Clears the specified igmp snooping groups.

unsolved problems:

- how to extend igmp snooping profile to support vpls

- how to define operational state data.

- welcome more vendors and carriers involved

- need more comments

- ericsson/jabil/huawei/cisco all involved.

- They have a meeting every monday.

Stig: pim-with-ipv4-prefix-over-ipv6-nh.

Ashutosh gupta is the main author.

Problem statement:

mcast routing needs a RPF tree to be formed in order to receive one copy of mcast data on lowest cost loop free path

in case of PIMv4, it needs a valid PIMv4 neighbor to send PIMv4 join

when using RFC5549, a IPv4 prefix is reachable over IPv6 next hop or vice versa

if rpf interface has more than 1 pimv4 neighbor, then a new pim mechanism is needed to choose corresponding neighbor for IPv6 next hop.

solution: use of secondary address list option in PIM hello

status:

- deployed by one cisco customer.

- looking for wg adoption

Toerless: is the join for the v4 still an v4 packet?

Stig: yes

Toerless: there is no interest to have a single address family pim adjacency.

Stig: there could be. there is v4 and v6 on the router interfaces.

Toerless: the address extension is in v4 or v6?

stig: there is a hello where the family should be same as interface itself.

Toerless: minimum recommendation is that v4 mapping is the hello option in v6 hello. one other logical next step is what is preferred solution. perhaps just build a v6 port connection. and can still send v4 joins.

Stig: you could send a pim join with v6 destination address that might contact v4 s,gs.

toerless: say prefer doing this in v6.

stig: there is also people trying to deploy v6 only in their core networks. and also deliver v4 payloads

toerless: first step make the control plane v6. and make v4 a service. get rid of native v4 packets is a different problem.

stig: would prefer to have this a separate thing. simple document. to do what you say to use v6 join to ask for v4 join that would make a change to pim spec.

toerless: would love protocol drafts to share best practices. have hello option in v6 pim.

stig: would like some guidance on whether wg should do this.
4 people have read. 4 people think we should adopt. will take to list.

Toerless: most of my comments don't have to go in this draft. maybe in mboned.

Stig as chair: think it would be interesting to look at this in mboned. people that deploy multicast. v4 mcast with v6 signalling. maybe talk to isps.