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IDR Co-chair + Shepherd for Intent-Based Drafts
Schedule for WG LC for CAR and CT

• WG LC from 2/1 to 2/22
  • Planned start - Depends on review of final documents
  • I will be contacting all people with open items

• CAR WG LC
  • draft-ietf-idr-bgp-car

• CT WG LC
  • Draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct
  • Draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct-srv6
CT Shepherd’s Comments
Susan Hares
WG LC shepherd reports on IDR Wiki

• CT WG LC – Shepherd’s report
  • https://github.com/ietf-wg-idr/draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct
  • https://wiki.ietf.org/e/en/group/idr/CT-WGLC

• Shepherd Report
  • draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct-srv6
  • https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/1trJ4Ga4rEE8fEXDdy2RUU20-64/
CT Status

• WG LC will include:
  • draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct
  • draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct-srv6

• Not include
  • draft-ietf-idr-multinexthop-attribute

• AD reviews
  • Need verification of Terminology

• Status:
  • Directorate reviews – Need verification + TSV
  • Need AD early reviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate Reviews</th>
<th>Version of CT</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Issues remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTG-DIR</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>Mohamed Boucadair</td>
<td>Has issues – Resolved in 22</td>
<td>None – addressed internal consistency of reserved bits. <a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/rtg-dir/aawFfvd29zERSBK4ydDDhxEQGRw">url</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS-DIR</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Bo Wu</td>
<td>Has Issues Resolved in 22</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ops-dir/Y5iv4v8pwHrmastZZbnd_CxFrx0">url</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS-DIR</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Bo Wu</td>
<td>Has 5 Nits Resolved in 22</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ops-dir/o5aunNn0G_YFPJMARHMOIHitZ9s">url</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec-DIR</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>Magnus Nystrom</td>
<td>Needs resolving Shepherd check 22</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/secdir/kFzE5B7LScmtHH1kyoxuC8dF178">url</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC-DIR</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Magnus Nystrom</td>
<td>Needs resolving</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/secdir/mUnuxyXUht0krQfIdMwjN2HsLKU">url</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSV-DIR</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Missing Reviews – Need checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Version of CT</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Issues remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDR chair team</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Keyur Patel</td>
<td>Verify -22</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/xset979NiR6GOwZ9huBExDcseVw/">https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/xset979NiR6GOwZ9huBExDcseVw/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>Jie Dong</td>
<td>In process – verify in</td>
<td><a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/x9CvxXtA4YF5lprx3T8Jm8NhdkM/">https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/x9CvxXtA4YF5lprx3T8Jm8NhdkM/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>Jeff Haas</td>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Directors</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>RTG ADs</td>
<td>Early review</td>
<td>Need early review of terminology, and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG LC comments</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Ketan Talaulikar</td>
<td>WG LC - review 22</td>
<td>Ketan comments: 1) SRv6 support requires features in individual drafts 2) Clear terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption comments</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Swadesh</td>
<td>Review -22</td>
<td>Comments on 1) RTC + 2) RD Note: CAR VPN with NLRI type 2 - uses RD + RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Github #1</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>Sue Hares</td>
<td>Github #1</td>
<td>First set of comments from Swadesh on RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Github #2</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>Sue Hares</td>
<td>Github #2</td>
<td>2nd set of comments from Swadesh on RD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSV review

• Please look at this draft from the viewpoint of having intent (color) aware customer traffic forwarded over a VPN overlay (tunnels) that forwarded over a set of intent (color) aware underlay of tunnels. Please consider the problems with tunnels in your review of this text.
CT WG LC – Are these resolved?

• CT-WGLC-Q1 – Ketan Talaulikar Comments
  • Inconsistent terminology
  • Remove text provided by other drafts
  • SRv6 support requires features in individual drafts
    • multinexthop (MNH), MPLS private labels, SRv6-interdomain
  • Specific technical issues (not mentioned in text)
  • Editorial/IDnits

• Need review from Ketan of
  • draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct-22 + draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ct-v6-01
CT Discussions from Adoption + 9/25 interim

• Mail discussion from 9/25 Interim
  • Swadesh – Adoption/WG LC issue:  [no discussion]
    F3-CT-Issue-6: CT’s Discussion (claims) of Benefits of using RD [Swadesh Agrawal]
    F3-WG-Issue-6: Benefits of Route Targets [Swadesh Agrawal]

    Text has been put in the -17. Please review -17 and send suggestions for improvements.
    IDR chair will follow-up

• Email links
  • F3-CT-Issue 6
    https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/IOYt6PiIHafrLjk4W6kqjWTGuSA/
  • F3-WG-Issue-6-CT
    https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/idr/E8XCqoTpccZfZqdFxHjjQ5rr6ck/
WG LC Early Directorate Reviews

• RTG DIR Review
  • Reviewer: Med Boucadair – (chair’s comment excellent RTG-DIR Review)
  • Status: Has issues
  • All issues addressed prior to WG LC - except Internal inconsistency of handling reserved bits
CT Status
Kaliraj Vairavakkalai
[kaliraj@juniper.net]
CTv6 Status

Natrajan Venkataraman
[natv@juniper.net]