RFC4601 Implementation & Deployment Survey

Taipei, Nov 2011

Vero Zheng (Huawei)
Jeffrey Zhang (Juniper)
Rishabh Parekh (Cisco)

Motivations

- Advancing PIM specification from Proposed Standard to Draft Standard
- Implementation & Deployment Report requested by IESG
  - As supporting document

Work & Plan

- -00 adopted as WG draft early Oct
- -01 draft with minor changes
- Survey: vendors and operators
  - Implementations & Deployments
  - Operational experiences
  - Survey Questionnaire
    - Split questions to operators and implementers

Questionnaire: On-going Effort

- Questions for operators:

  1. Have you deployed PIM-SM in your network?
  2. Are you aware that the PIM-SM deployed is RFC2632 based or RFC4601 based?
  3. Are you using equipment with different (multi-vendor) PIM-SM implementations for your deployment?
  4. Have you encountered any inter-operability or backward-compatibility issues amongst differing implementations? If yes, what are your concerns about these issues?

Questionnaire: On-going Effort

- Questions for operators:

  5. Have you deployed different multicast protocols in different parts of your network, such as dense mode and sparse mode, where you have multicast routed between the two parts? If yes, do you know if this is done using features such as (*,*,RP) and PMBR?
  6. To what extent have you deployed ancillary PIM functionality, like e.g. BSR, SSM, and Explicit Tracking?
  7. Do you have any other comments on PIM-SM deployment in your network?

Questionnaire: On-going Effort

- Questions for implementers :

   1. Have you implemented PIM-SM?
   2. Is the PIM-SM implementation based on RFC 2632 or RFC 4601?
   3. Have you implemented (*,*, RP) state of RFC 4601? What is the rationale behind implementing or omitting (*,*,RP)?
   4. Have you implemented the PMBR as specified in RFC 4601 and RFC 2715? What is the rationale behind implementing or omitting PMBR?

Questionnaire: On-going Effort

- Questions for implementers :

  5. Have you implemented other features and functions of RFC 4601, e.g. Border bit for PIM registers, Explicit tracking, Hashing of group to RP mappings, IPv6 register PMTUD and Register DSCP/ECN bits?
  6. Have you done any inter-operatibility trials with other PIM-SM implementations based on RFC 4601 or RFC 2362? If yes, have you encountered any issues during these trials?
  7. Do you have any other comments or concerns about PIM-SM as specified in RFC4601?

Request For Comments!

- Your involvement and feedback are very important
  - Past effort has not got much responses
  - Would prefer to get more feedback on Questionnaire