

IDR WG
Interim, October 26, 2018

Susan Hares and John Scudder

IDR Co-chairs

Jie Dong (WG Secretary)

Note Well

•This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

•As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

•Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

WG status

- Chairs will report online, by Routing Area Open Meeting (Thursday, November 1)
 - (Many WG actions in progress or requested.)

Registries, use of FCFS

- Per RFC 8126, “assignments are made to anyone on a first come, first served basis. There is no substantive review of the request”
- This means exactly what it says – there is no gatekeeper. You do not need anyone’s permission, not even the WG chairs.
 - But if you need help, the chairs are glad to advise.
- But please be a good citizen. Permissionless work is great as long as the system is not abused.
 - So far, no abuses or problems noticed. Just benefit.

Autodiscovery

- Evident interest in this topic from many WG participants
- No chartered WG work item
- Related work in LSVR, led to request from Area Director (Alvaro) to try to focus the WG's direction
 - ~“If the IETF is going to work on a discovery, can't we please just work on *one* approach?”~

Proposals (that jgs is aware of)

- draft-ymbk-lsvr-lsoe-02
- draft-acee-idr-lldp-peer-discovery-03
- draft-heitz-idr-msdc-fabric-autoconf-00
- draft-xu-idr-neighbor-autodiscovery-10
- draft-raszuk-idr-bgp-auto-session-setup-00

Similarities, Differences

- Completely centralized? (heitz)
- UDP/IP-based? (xu, raszuk) Non-IP? (acee, ymbk)
- Advertisement/bootstrapping? (acee, ymbk, raszuk) Hello protocol/session maintenance? (xu)
- Minimal/completist? (...)

Towards Requirements

- Only one (almost) common requirement emerges: bootstrap single-hop EBGP
- The union of requirements (implicit or explicit) is quite large, though.

Potential Next Steps

- Does the WG want to charter work on discovery? If so...
 - It seems self-evident we should strive for one solution and not > 1 .
 - Is there an obvious starting point as a WG doc?
 - If not, probable next step is a follow-on interim focused on this topic.
 - Design team approach seems likely given the number of (non-converging) proposals.

In the mean time...

- LSoE is a proposal in LSVR, not IDR
 - It does not – directly – provide BGP discovery
 - However, it provides similar hooks to LLDP
- Request from AD was approximately for IDR to either ratify this approach, or reject it
 - We have not done either
 - Chair's recommendation to AD/LSVR was to proceed ahead with LSoE adoption request in LSVR – but know that IDR may *not* use it

Discussion?