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Progress since last IETF

- **03 to 04**
  - Updates from 1st WGLC and agreements in London IETF
  - Implementation & deployment decide on the granularity at which an Instruction Message works
  - Appendix added with examples of Measurement Agents and Peers in various deployment scenarios. To help clarify what these terms mean

- **04 to 05**
  - Updates from 2nd WGLC
  - Measurement Method, specified as a URI to a registry entry (rather than a URN)
  - Removed mention of Data Transfer Tasks. This abstraction is left to the information model i-d

- **05 to 06**
  - Different roles in a Measurement Method (requester and responder, for instance)
  - Suppression: there is now the concept of a flag (boolean) which indicates whether a Task is by default gets suppressed or not.
  - The optional suppression message (with list of specific tasks/schedules to suppress) over-rides this flag.

- **06 to 07**
  - Editorials

- **Overall – keeping aligned with Information Model i-d**
- **Comments in 3rd WGLC (next slide)**
  - Thanks to Ken Ko, Dan Romascunu, Juergen Schoenwaelder
  - Consensus that ready for IESG
  - Will update in next week or two
WGLC #3 comments

- What does the MA do if it gets a 2nd suppress message?
  - Replaces the previous info
- Suppress with option listing both specific Tasks and Schedules to suppress. Is this allowed? What does MA do?
  - Yes. MA suppresses everything in either list (the Union)
- Suppression flag.
  - Is this an Input Parameter for the Measurement Method, or is it better to define as a new field?
- Measurement Method role:
  - Is this an Input Parameter for the Measurement Method, or is it better to define as a new field?
- Network address used for the measurements needs to be reported
  - Agree. Also needs adding to Info model
- The time of the acquisition of the Management Results is included in the reports – is there any requirement on a minimal granularity, or clocks synchronization?
  - No, this is just the MA's estimate of the time
- I would have preferred the document to be more concise and less repetitive. ... I suggest to move section 6 into the appendix next to the deployment examples (or even better merge the section with appendix A since there is yet more redundancy)
  - Move S6 to Appendix
• That’s it ... until we get IESG comments