Routing Over Large Clouds Working Group

Monday, Dec 4, 1995 0930-1130,
Tuesday Dec 5, 1995 1530-1730

Chair: Andrew G. Malis
ascom Nexion
malis@nexen.com

discussion: rolc@nexen.com

(un)subscribe requests to:rolc-request@nexen.com

Archive: ftp://ietf.cnri.reston.va.us/ietf-mail-archive/rolc

Agenda

1. Agenda Bashing
2. ATM Forum/MPOA update
3. NHRP specification and open issues
   - draft-ietf-rolc-nhrp-06.txt
4. Local/Remote Forwarding Decision
   - draft-ietf-rolc-apr-03.txt
5. Mobile NHRP Devices
   - draft-horikawa-mobile-nhrp-00.txt
6. Additional Topics
   - NHRP/ATMARP/MARS interactions
   - Router/Router NHRP
7. Status and Workplan

Workplan

Dec 95 Final call on NHRP v1 protocol spec (once and for all), submit APR document as informational RFC.

Jan 96 Submit NHRP document to IESG as a Proposed Standard.

Mar 96 Discuss v1 companion documents (Applicability Statement, Protocol Analysis, MIB) and router-router NHRP (v2) in LA.

Workplan (cont.)

Jun 96 Discuss v1 implementation/ interoperability issues, final call on v1 companion documents, further discuss NHRP v2.

Dec 96 Discuss v1 protocol experience doc, final call on v2 spec, begin v2 companion docs.

ROLC Status Report to IP/ATM

- Agreed with Grenville Armitage on following NHRP/MARS harmonization changes to ipmc-09:
  - The “Hardware Type” field is now “Address Family” field
  - NHRP now conforms with MARS address coding rules (no padding to 32-bit boundaries)
- ROLC’s consensus is that all references to NHRP should be removed from the classic2-00 draft; instead, a separate transition plan will be drafted

ROLC/IPATM Liaison to the ATM Forum

The Routing Over Large Clouds and IP over ATM Working Groups of the IETF desire the use of a general purpose configuration service on ATM networks. If at all possible, the IETF would prefer to use an existing "native" service, such as that provided by the ATM Forum's LAN Emulation Configuration Server, rather than invent one itself.

The IETF is concerned with the currently planned LANEv2.0 direction with respect to use of multiple LECS's. The IETF believes that the specification should permit more than one LECS for each "ELAN administrative domain" in order to preclude a loss of service opportunity. The second and subsequent LECS's must be able to be deployed as "hot standbys". It is desirable to define a standardized protocol to synchronize the database information between multiple LECS's.