Usage of The RSVP Association Object

draft-ietf-ccamp-assoc-info-02.txt

Lou Berger   <lberger@labn.net>

Question from last IETF:
One draft or two?

❖ draft-ietf-ccamp-assoc-info-0**1** covered:

1. Informational usage for GMPLS recovery
2. Standards track extensions for non-GMPLS recovery usage and Extended association

❖ Discussed at IETF 80:
Should Information and Standards track sections be separated? E.g.:

1. "Usage of The RSVP Association Object"
2. "RSVP Association Object Extensions "

➔ Consensus to separate

This presentation covers #1

draft-ietf-ccamp-assoc-info-02

Draft now only has one part:

1. Informational (Discussed at IETF 74-76)
   - ❏ No new procedures or formats
   - ❏ Is essentially formal write of Adrian's E-mail on the topic
     - o Subject: Re: Clearing up your misunderstanding of the Association ID
     - o From: "Adrian Farrel" <adrian at olddog.co.uk>
     - o Date: Tue, 18 Nov 2008 22:34:14 -0000
     - o http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ccamp/current/msg00644.html
   - ❏ Covers ASSOCIATION Object as defined in RFC 4872 and RFC 4873 (GMPLS Only)
     - o Reviews object definition
     - o Analyzes conformance (RFC2119) language of each
     - o Identifies valid Association ID use cases
     - o Describes receiver processing to handle cases

Next steps

❖ Draft stable

  ❑ Only minor changes in March 2010 (on top of 2009 rev)

❖ Ready to move forward / LC

  ❑ Perhaps wait for LC until extensions draft ready?

❖ Early reviews would be appreciated!