

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 26 August 2021

J. Head  
A. Przygienda  
Juniper Networks  
22 February 2021

RIFT Keys Structure and Well-Known Registry in Key Value TIE  
draft-head-rift-kv-registry-00

## Abstract

Routing in Fat-Trees RIFT [[RIFT](#)] allows for key/value pairs to be advertised within Key-Value Topology Information Elements (KV TIEs). The data contained within these KV TIEs can be used for any imaginable purpose. This document defines the various Key Types (i.e. Well-Known, OUI, and Experimental) and a method to structure corresponding values.

## Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 26 August 2021.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

Internet-Draft

[draft-head-rift-kv-registry-00](#)

February 2021

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Description . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Key-Value Pair Structure . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Well-Known Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	OUI Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	Experimental Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Key Type Registry . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.1.1.</a>	Requested Entries . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Experimental Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.1.</a>	Requested Entries . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Well-Known Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.3.1.</a>	Requested Entries . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.4.</a>	OUI Key Type . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.4.1.</a>	Requested Entries . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>

## [1.](#) Description

Routing in Fat-Trees (RIFT [[RIFT](#)]) allows for key/value pairs to be advertised within Key-Value Topology Information Elements (KV TIEs). There are no restrictions placed on the type of data that is contained in KV TIEs nor what the data is used for. It could contain a simple string or even Thrift encoded data. However, the KV elements SHOULD NOT be used to carry topology information used by RIFT itself to perform distributed computations.

This document defines a Key Type Registry to maintain Well-Known and vendor specific Key Types in order to simplify interoperability between implementations and eliminate the risk of collision for

future implementations. An Experimental Key Type is additionally defined.

## 2. Key-Value Pair Structure

Figure 1 illustrates the generic Key-Value Pair structure.




Figure 1: Generic Key-Value Structure

where:

### Key-Type:

A 1-byte value that identifies the Key Type. It MUST be a reserved value from the Key Value Type Registry that is defined later in this document.

### Key Identifier:

A 3-byte value that identifies the specific Key and describes the structure of the contained values.

### Values:

A variable length value that contains data associated with the Key. It SHOULD contain 1 or more elements. Whether the collection of elements allows duplicates and/or is ordered is governed by the particular key identifier.

### 2.1. Well-Known Key Type

This section reserves a value in the Key Type Registry to indicate Well-Known Key Types that all implementations SHOULD support.

As shown in Figure 2, the Key-Type will be used to identify that the Key Type is Well-Known. The Key Identifier will be used to identify the specific Key and describe the structure of the contained values.




Figure 2: Well-Known Key Type

## 2.2. OUI Key Type

This section reserves a value in the Key Type Registry to indicate an OUI (vendor-specific) Key Type that any implementation MAY support.

As shown in Figure 3, the Key-Type will be used to identify the Key Type as OUI. The Key Identifier MUST use an organization's reserved OUI space to indicate the Key and value structure.




Figure 3: OUI Key Type

### 2.3. Experimental Key Type

This section reserves a value in the Key Type Registry to indicate an Experimental Key Type.

As shown in Figure 4, the Key-Type will be used to identify the Key Type as Experimental. The Key Identifier will be used to identify the specific experimental Key and describe the structure of the contained values.




Figure 4: Experimental Key Type

## 3. IANA Considerations

This section requests that IANA help govern Key Types via the usual IANA registry procedures as per [\[RFC8126\]](#).

All values not suggested are available for assignment. The allocation of new values MUST be done via "Expert Review" procedures.

### 3.1. Key Type Registry

This section defines the Key Type Registry that is used to identify a

specific Key Type. It also suggests values for Experimental, Well-Known, and OUI Key Types.

The range of valid values is 1 - 255.

0 is an illegal value and MUST NOT be allocated to or used by any implementation. It MUST be ignored on reception.

#### [3.1.1.](#) Requested Entries

Key Type	Value	Description
Experimental	TBD1	Indicates that the Key is Experimental.
Well-Known	TBD2	Indicates that the Key is Well-Known.
OUI	TBD3	Indicates that the Key is OUI.

Table 1

#### [3.2.](#) Experimental Key Type

This value indicates that a specific key is Experimental.

The range of valid values is 1 - 16777215 ( $2^{24}-1$ ).

0 is an illegal value and MUST NOT be allocated to or used by any implementation. It MUST be ignored on reception.

#### [3.2.1.](#) Requested Entries

Experimental Key	Identifier	Description
Illegal	0	Not allowed.

Table 2

### 3.3. Well-Known Key Type

This value indicates that a specific key is Well-Known.

The range of valid values is 1 - 16777215 ( $2^{24}-1$ ).

0 is an illegal value and MUST not be allocated to or used by any implementation. It MUST be ignored on reception.

#### 3.3.1. Requested Entries

Well-Known Key	Identifier	Description
Illegal	0	Not allowed.
MAC/IP Binding	TBD1	To be defined.
FAM Security Roll-Over Key	TBD2	To be defined.

Table 3

### 3.4. OUI Key Type

This value indicates a specific OUI Key using an organization's reserved OUI space.

The range of valid values is 1 - 16777215 ( $2^{24}-1$ ).

0 is an illegal value and MUST NOT be allocated to or used by any implementation. It MUST be ignored on reception.

#### 3.4.1. Requested Entries

OUI Key	Identifier	Description
Illegal	0	Not allowed.

Table 4

#### [4.](#) Security Considerations

This document introduces no new security concerns to RIFT or other specifications referenced in this document given that the TIEs that carry KV pairs are already extensively secured by the RIFT [[RIFT](#)] specification itself.

#### [5.](#) Acknowledgements

To be provided.

#### [6.](#) Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.
- [RIFT] Przygienda, T., Sharma, A., Thubert, P., Rijtsman, B., and D. Afanasiev, "RIFT: Routing in Fat Trees", Work in Progress, [draft-ietf-rift-rift-12](#), May 2020.

#### Authors' Addresses

Jordan Head  
Juniper Networks  
1137 Innovation Way  
Sunnyvale, CA  
United States of America

Email: [jhead@juniper.net](mailto:jhead@juniper.net)

Juniper Networks  
1137 Innovation Way  
Sunnyvale, CA  
United States of America

Email: [prz@juniper.net](mailto:prz@juniper.net)