Toerless>Please convert to text, remove “GXS>” prefixes, check fixes

As required by RFC 4858, this is the current template for the Document

Shepherd Write-Up.

Changes are expected over time. This version is dated 24 February 2012.

(1) What type of RFC is being requested (BCP, Proposed Standard,

Internet Standard, Informational, Experimental, or Historic)? Why

is this the proper type of RFC? Is this type of RFC indicated in the

title page header?

draft-ietf-bier-te-arch is Proposed Standard. This is indicated on the title page.

(2) The IESG approval announcement includes a Document Announcement

Write-Up. Please provide such a Document Announcement Write-Up. Recent

examples can be found in the "Action" announcements for approved

documents. The approval announcement contains the following sections:

Technical Summary

This draft presents a stateless path steering mechanism for BIER, called BIER TE (Tree Engineering for Bit Index Explicit Replication). Bitstring sematic of BIER-TE is different from BIER defined in RFC 8279, which indicates adjacencies, but it could reuse the forwarding engine of BIER. The BIFT of each BFR only contains the BPs that are adjacent to the BFR in BIER-TE topology. BIER-TE doesn’t depend on any IGP protocols as routing underlay.

Working Group Summary

The name of the mechanism defined in the draft has been discussed in the WG during last call, which was changed from “BIER traffic engineering” to “BIER tree engineering”, considering that it only covers the path steering function in the overall solution of traffic engineering. Any BIER traffic engineering mechanism could use this mechanism.

Document Quality

After full discussions and multiple revisions, there is solid consensus for this document in WG. It is ready for adoption. No implementation was yet announced in the BIER WG. No formal language is used in the document (there is some informal pseudo-code without formal verification tools). No aspects of the document required expert review.

Personnel

Who is the Document Shepherd? Who is the Responsible Area Director?

GXS> Geng Xuesong is the shepherd and Alvaro Retana is the Responsible Area Director

1.a) Who is the Document Shepherd for this document? Has the

Document Shepherd personally reviewed this version of the

document and, in particular, does he or she believe this

version is ready for forwarding to the IESG for publication?

Geng Xuesong, Yes she has reviewed the version 8 of draft-ietf-bier-te-arch. Her concerns where addressed by the authors in version 9. She believes this version is now ready for forwarding to the IESG for publication.

(1.b) Has the document had adequate review both from key WG members

and from key non-WG members? Does the Document Shepherd have

any concerns about the depth or breadth of the reviews that

have been performed?

Yes. See acknowledgement section for list of key reviewers, including Lou Berger, TEAS chair. This document has been reviewed, and there is no concern about depth or breadth about the previous reviews..

(1.c) Does the Document Shepherd have concerns that the document

needs more review from a particular or broader perspective,

e.g., security, operational complexity, someone familiar with

AAA, internationalization, or XML?

No.

(1.d) Does the Document Shepherd have any specific concerns or

issues with this document that the Responsible Area Director

and/or the IESG should be aware of? For example, perhaps he

or she is uncomfortable with certain parts of the document, or

has concerns whether there really is a need for it. In any

event, if the WG has discussed those issues and has indicated

that it still wishes to advance the document, detail those

concerns here. Has an IPR disclosure related to this document

been filed? If so, please include a reference to the

disclosure and summarize the WG discussion and conclusion on

this issue.

The shepherd has no concerns.

The Shepherd received confirmation from all authors that all IPR they are aware of has been disclosed to the IETF:

https://datatracker.ietf.org/ipr/search/?submit=draft&id=draft-ietf-bier-te-arch

(1.e) How solid is the WG consensus behind this document? Does it

represent the strong concurrence of a few individuals, with

others being silent, or does the WG as a whole understand and

agree with it?

The WG consensus for this draft is very solid.

(1.f) Has anyone threatened an appeal or otherwise indicated extreme

discontent? If so, please summarize the areas of conflict in

separate email messages to the Responsible Area Director. (It

should be in a separate email because this questionnaire is

entered into the ID Tracker.)

Negative.

(1.g) Has the Document Shepherd personally verified that the

document satisfies all ID nits? (See

http://www.ietf.org/ID-Checklist.html and

http://tools.ietf.org/tools/idnits/.) Boilerplate checks are

not enough; this check needs to be thorough. Has the document

met all formal review criteria it needs to, such as the MIB

Doctor, media type, and URI type reviews? If the document

does not already indicate its intended status at the top of

the first page, please indicate the intended status here.

Yes, the shepherd has verified idnits. Only warnings where found by the tools which have been identified to be issues of the idnits tools, not of the document. The intend status of the document is correctly indicated, formal review criteria are met (are not applicable).

(1.h) Has the document split its references into normative and

informative? Are there normative references to documents that

are not ready for advancement or are otherwise in an unclear

state? If such normative references exist, what is the

strategy for their completion? Are there normative references

that are downward references, as described in [RFC3967]? If

so, list these downward references to support the Area

Director in the Last Call procedure for them [RFC3967].

Yes the document is split to normative and informative references. Documents that are normative references are in a clear state (no pending or downrevs).

(1.i) Has the Document Shepherd verified that the document's IANA

Considerations section exists and is consistent with the body

of the document? If the document specifies protocol

extensions, are reservations requested in appropriate IANA

registries? Are the IANA registries clearly identified? If

the document creates a new registry, does it define the

proposed initial contents of the registry and an allocation

procedure for future registrations? Does it suggest a

reasonable name for the new registry? See [RFC2434]. If the

document describes an Expert Review process, has the Document

Shepherd conferred with the Responsible Area Director so that

the IESG can appoint the needed Expert during IESG Evaluation?

This document requests no action by IANA.

(1.j) Has the Document Shepherd verified that sections of the

document that are written in a formal language, such as XML

code, BNF rules, MIB definitions, etc., validate correctly in

an automated checker?

No applicable.