

# IPPM WG Agenda

7 November 2005, Vancouver

# IPPM Working Group

- Chairs:
  - Henk Uijterwaal <henk@ripe.net>
  - Matt Zekauskas <matt@internet2.edu>
- Email:
  - `ippm@ietf.org`
  - `ippm-request@ietf.org`
  - <https://www1.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/ippm>

# Agenda

- **Administrativa:**
  - Agenda Bashing
  - Scribe
  - Minutes
  - Blue Sheets
  - Full agenda: 10 minutes/speaker + 5 mins of discussion
- **Status of Drafts and Milestones**

# Agenda (2)

- Draft-svdberg-ippm-temporal-00.txt
  - Steven van de Berghe
- Decomposition of metrics
  - Al Morton, draft-morton-ippm-composition-01
- Draft-stephan-ippm-multimetrics-01.txt
  - Emile Stephan
- ITU on IP performance models (Y1541)
  - Loki Jorgenson

# Agenda (3)

- Differences between Interpacket jitter metric and 99-0 percentile ITU measure
  - Roman Krasnowski
- Draft-niccolini-ippm-storetracerooutes-01
  - Juergen Quittek,
- TWAMP draft
  - Kaynam Hedayat
- ITU liaison on NSIS
  - Al Morton
- AOB

# Status of drafts and milestones

# Drafts not discussed today

- OWAMP: draft-ietf-ippm-owdp-14.txt
  - Ping Russ Housley
- Implementation report: draft-ietf-ippm-implement-01
  - Discuss next steps with AD
- Capacity draft: draft-ietf-ippm-bw-capacity-00

# Reordering draft

- 2 contributions
  - draft-ietf-ippm-reordering (“Group draft”)
  - draft-jayasumana-reorder-density (“CSU draft”)
- Issues:

# Reordering draft/Content

- Review by >10 people
- Stable for a year
- The CSU group doubts the usefulness of the metrics
- Otherwise consensus on the draft

# Reordering draft/Origin of idea

- CSU claims that byte-offset is based on reordering buffer density
- However:
  - First IPPM draft well before the CSU draft (2001)
  - Some of the CSU authors participated in the early group discussions
  - Development was in parallel
  - Impossible to figure out who said what 3-4 years afterwards

# Reordering draft/Next steps

- Should the CSU draft become a WG doc?
- Draft has been presented several times
- No support for it

# Reordering Proposal

- Add stable reference to CSU draft in group draft and ensure CSU is in the acknowledgements
- Do a WGLC for the group document
  - Rough consensus
  - Support by all except 1
- Do not make the CSU draft a WG document
- Post this to the list

# Milestones

- Collect implementation reports for RFCs 2678-2681
- Submit draft on a packet reordering metric to the IESG for Proposed Standard
- Submit link bandwidth capacity definitions draft to the IESG, for consideration as an Informational RFC
- Milestones for new work items to be added
- Develop new charter text