

Susan Hares

I can hear.10:01:59

John Scudder

can you hear me yes/no?10:02:33

Daniam Henriques

yesss weee caaannn10:02:44

Anurag Prakash

Yes10:02:46

Chenhao Ma

Yes10:03:01

dhruv-dhody

loosing audio10:16:06

Randy Bush

her jgs not speaker10:16:26

Robert Raszuk

On RD-ORF there was number of technical problems sent on the list. None of them were addressed. This is not right way to filter VPN routes. Thx10:21:11

Tom Hill

R don not maintain any VRFs.10:21:34

* "RR don not maintain any VRFs." in section #1.10:21:51

Robert Raszuk

The proposal does not require VRFs on RRs but this is not enough10:22:11

they are doing filtering on vpnv4 AF itself10:22:33

Joel Halpern

Hmm. I thought the ifit proposal in other WGs was distinct from the ioam and alternative marking proposals.10:26:32

Ketan Talaulikar

Having a routing/control plane considerations of IFIT proposal in some document would help. Right now it is being introduced in multiple protocols but I am not getting a proper picture. Please point to any document/section that I am missing here.10:30:07

Susan Hares

Joel ... shall I add your comment on the ifit to the minutes?10:35:00

Joel Halpern

@Sue: I suppose.10:39:07

Jeffrey Haas

Jie, would you please repost the general rtc draft name?10:39:20

Jie, Juniper's implementation of rt-c allows for shorter than host length for rtc filtering10:40:26

Haibo, rt-c RFC 4684 is applied to many address families. This extension works in a similarly address family agnostic fashion.10:42:04

Ketan Taulikar

I'll post my comment here to save time. BGP-LS has been specified as a northbound distribution mechanism for topology information from network to controllers. One of these drafts is proposing to re-purpose BGP-LS for southbound provisioning. Leaving aside whether BGP is suitable for this, why not consider doing this as a separate Config SAFI?^{10:42:53}

Jie Dong

@Jeff here is the draft I mentioned:<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-dong-idr-vpn-route-constrain-02>^{10:43:48}

Jeffrey Haas

Thank you, Jie. I recall reviewing it at the time. I'll re-review for applicability to our problem.^{10:44:18}

Jie Dong

another question is can the Bitmask RT be advertised in RTC as prefix?^{10:45:14}

Jeffrey Haas

Jie, there's still some encoding discussions happening with the authors about how a wide community rt-c would look, even for a dense case like we have in the proposed draft.^{10:46:13}

Haibo Wang

@Jeff, Yes, RFC4684 is applied to many address families, but I don't think it's a good idea. If we want to extension the RTC, why not we may set AFI to resolve the problem like Jie has show^{10:46:22}

Jeffrey Haas

Please expect us to followup the list on that point, Jie.^{10:46:30}

Robert Raszuk

@Jie RFC4684 does not allow to send RT as a prefix ... NLRI says fixed 8 octets. I proposed to authors addition of RT as a variable length prefix as well - but that was not mentioned during the presentation^{10:47:26}

Giuseppe Fioccola

@Ketan good point we will give a proper picture in the next revision^{10:47:27}

Jeffrey Haas

Haibo, this discussion point covers a portion of what we had with the draft Jie had posted moments ago. We don't currently segregate route target types to specific vpn technologies.^{10:47:32}

Haibo Wang

My another comments is that, whether should we to do it like RTC or like RFC7543 CP-ORF^{10:48:05}

Jeffrey Haas

Your memory for rfc 4684 is incorrect, Robert: "The NLRI field in the MP_REACH_NLRI and MP_UNREACH_NLRI is a prefix of 0 to 96 bits, encoded as defined in Section 4 of [5]."10:48:45

Robert Raszuk

Clearly as RTC ... ORF is not transitive10:48:47

RFC7543 relies on RRs doing the work10:49:02

Ketan Talaulikar

@ Giuseppe. Thanks. Would really appreciate a sort of routing consideration section in your base IFIT document that puts out requirements for all these various routing protocols that you are proposing to add IFIT extensions to. It would make it easier for review.10:49:04

Robert Raszuk

@Jeff - yes I take it back ... I was thinking about SAFI 128 not RTC10:52:09

Jeffrey Haas

It's okay, Robert. We keep repeating that point about 4684, so it's clear that it's in people's heads as being fixed length for some reason.10:53:44

Giuseppe Fioccola

@Joel yes in other documents IFIT is also associated with the framework but in this document we just use IFIT acronym as "In situ Flow Information Telemetry" to summarize in one word IOAM and Alt Mark methods10:53:45

Bill Fenner

@jhaas in fact I had to fix tcpdump for that case too10:54:14

Jeffrey Haas

Bill, probably because of our implementation. :-)10:54:30

Robert Raszuk

Probably as RFC does not show length field in the figure :)10:55:17
and figure says 8 bytes not 0-8 bytes too10:55:45

Susan Hares

Joel -- it is not a requirement.. I am simply asking.10:55:55

Jeffrey Haas

That would make sense, Robert. That may be worth an errata.10:56:12

Robert Raszuk

Agree.10:56:29

Giuseppe Fioccola

@Ketan A new section in the beginning of the draft can help to clarify. We will work on that10:59:10

@Ketan A new section in the beginning of the draft can help to clarify. We will work on that10:59:10

Joel Halpern

@Sue, I think it would be useful to put my question and Giuseppe's answer in the minutes.11:01:14

@Giuseppe - given the different use of the term, I find it confusing to use it in this draft to mean "these two other things".11:01:58

@Giuseppe - depending upon how the draft evolves, the term may well become irrelevant. In which case it is not needed.

Jeffrey Haas

Shuping, with regard to the link MTU draft, I think it's a useful feature. However, I would suggest the document provide a warning that this is the signaled MTU which may be different in bad cases from the actual MTU. this is usually from configuration mismatches in a control plane and a data plane component.11:04:57

Tom Hill

+1 Jeffrey & Ketan - there are many "MTUs"11:06:25

It is otherwise not a bad idea11:06:49

Jeffrey Haas

IMO, having a way for probed MTU to be published in bgp-ls is a nice feature.11:06:52
but since one of the pathological cases is LAG with mismatched MTU component links...11:07:18

Takuya Miyasaka

The title of this document is confusing. I think it should be [BGP-LS Extensions for Advertising "Link" MTU].11:08:13

Susan Hares

@ketan ..where was the draft you were comparing a draft in.11:10:00

@ketan - did you say trill?11:10:11

@ketan - I'm taking notes.11:10:20

Ketan Talaulikar

The RFC7176 referred for the ISIS MTU is actually a Trill draft.11:10:55

Giuseppe Fioccola

@Joel Yes in this case we only use "IFIT" while the other documents refer to "IFIT framework" since it is about the architecture that is out of scope in this document. Anyway I agree we should clarify the use of the term in the draft to avoid confusion11:10:59

Susan Hares

yes.. I was shepherd for that draft.11:11:14

Shuping Peng

@Jeffrey, thank you for the comments. Your concern is acknowledged and we plan to add it in the next version.11:12:07

Alvaro Retana

@Ketan: The registry shows that the sub-TLV applies to the "normal" TLVs: 22, 23, etc.. It seems to me that we should be ok.11:12:10

Ketan Talaulikar

@ Alvaro : yes we should ok
[microphone failure]

Robert Raszuk

I will put it here11:18:59

Gunter Van de Velde

Alternative is to bypass the request. Click on the other micro symbol and go directly to micro11:19:42

"send Audio"11:20:04

Robert Raszuk

Today transport class can be embedded in the SID. Here we are opening it up to explicit signalling ... I understand you may want to support RSVP TE but not sure if this extra complexity is really needed11:20:25

Jeffrey Haas

Robert, while it can cover such a scenario, this draft supplants the problems we were trying to solve in the prior labeled-color-unicast draft.11:21:09

So, a degree of similar flexibility is desired.11:21:19

Susan Hares

Robert - do you want me to read your question?11:21:39

Robert Raszuk

I like the new SAFI separation if we go for that .. I recall the BGP 3107 discussions about it too. Just not sure we still need it if we are up to SR everywhere paradigm :)11:22:05

@ Sue - pls do11:22:11

Srihari Sangli

@Robert - having an option to support different transport networks (like RSVP, etc) is a good thing11:22:13

Robert Raszuk

Thx Sue11:23:00

The 3107 was just to Jeff's point :)11:24:00

Susan Hares

sorry .. misunderstood.11:24:13

Robert Raszuk

no problem11:24:20

Tom Hill

Based on the start of the week, it is a miracle :)11:26:13

dhruv-dhody

byeee11:48:33

Jie Dong

thanks everyone, see you on next meeting^{11:48:42}

Susan Hares

If you miss sending the draft information - send it to me in email.