

Workgroup: Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft:  
draft-ietf-lisp-map-server-reliable-  
transport-03

Published: 20 October 2023

Intended Status: Experimental

Expires: 22 April 2024

Authors: B. Pitta            M. Portoles        D. Lewis  
          Cisco Systems    Cisco Systems    ICANN  
          I. Kouvelas            C. Cassar  
          Arista Networks Inc.   Rivian Automotive

## **LISP Map Server Reliable Transport**

### **Abstract**

The communication between LISP ETRs and Map-Servers is based on unreliable UDP message exchange coupled with periodic message transmission in order to maintain soft state. The drawback of periodic messaging is the constant load imposed on both the ETR and the Map-Server. New use cases for LISP have increased the amount of state that needs to be communicated with requirements that are not satisfied by the current mechanism. This document introduces the use of a reliable transport for ETR to Map-Server communication in order to eliminate the periodic messaging overhead, while providing reliability, flow-control and endpoint liveness detection.

### **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 22 April 2024.

### **Copyright Notice**

Copyright (c) 2023 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Requirements Notation](#)
- [3. Message Format](#)
- [4. Session Establishment](#)
  - [4.1. Signaling to Trigger Session Establishment](#)
  - [4.2. Transport Protocol and Port Usage](#)
- [5. Error Notifications](#)
- [6. EID Prefix Registration](#)
  - [6.1. Reliable Mapping Registration Messages](#)
    - [6.1.1. Registration Message](#)
    - [6.1.2. Registration Acknowledgement Message](#)
    - [6.1.3. Registration Rejection Message](#)
    - [6.1.4. Registration Refresh Message](#)
    - [6.1.5. Mapping Notification Message](#)
  - [6.2. ETR Behavior](#)
  - [6.3. Map-Server Behavior](#)
- [7. Security Considerations](#)
- [8. IANA Considerations](#)
  - [8.1. LISP Reliable Transport Message Types](#)
  - [8.2. Transport Protocol Port Numbers](#)
- [9. Contributors](#)
- [10. Acknowledgments](#)
- [11. Normative References](#)
- [Authors' Addresses](#)

## 1. Introduction

The communication channel between LISP ETRs and Map-Servers is based on unreliable UDP message exchange [[RFC9301](#)]. Where required, reliability is pursued through periodic retransmissions that maintain soft state on the peer. Map-Register messages are retransmitted every minute by an ETR and the Map-Server times out its state if the state is not refreshed for three successive periods. When registering multiple EID-Prefixes, the ETR includes multiple mapping records in the Map-Register message. Packet size limitations provide an upper bound to the number of mapping records that can be placed in each Map-Register message. When the ETR has

more EID-Prefixes to register than can be packed in a single Map-Register message, the mapping records for the EID-Prefixes are split across multiple Map-Register messages.

The drawback of the periodic registration is the constant load that it introduces on both the ETR and the Map-Server. The ETR uses resources to periodically build and transmit the Map-Register messages, and to process the resulting Map-Notify messages issued by the Map-Server. The Map-Server uses resources to process the received Map-Register messages, update the corresponding registration state, and build and transmit the matching Map-Notify messages. When the number of EID-Prefixes to be registered by an ETR is small, the resulting load imposed by periodic registrations may not be significant. The ETR will only transmit a single Map-Register message each period that contains a small number of mapping records.

In some LISP deployments, a large set of EID-Prefixes must be registered by each ETR (e.g. mobility, database redistribution). Use cases with a large set of EID-Prefixes behind an ETR will result in a much higher load. An example is LISP mobility deployments where EID-Prefixes are limited to host entries. ETRs may have thousands of hosts to register resulting in hundreds of Map-Register and Map-Notify messages per registration period.

A transport is required for the ETR to Map-Server communication that provides reliability, flow-control and endpoint liveness notifications. This document describes the use of TCP as a LISP reliable transport. The initial application for the LISP reliable transport session is the support of scalable EID prefix registration. The reliable session mechanism is defined to be extensible so that it can support additional LISP communication requirements as they arise using a single reliable transport session between an ETR and a Map-Server. The use of the reliable transport session for EID prefix registration is an alternative and does not replace the existing UDP based mechanism.

## **2. Requirements Notation**


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 [[RFC2119](#)].

## **3. Message Format**

A single LISP reliable transport session may carry information for multiple LISP applications. One such application is the registration of EID to RLOC mappings that operates over a session between an ETR and a Map-Server. Communication over a session is based on the exchange of messages. This document defines a base set of messages

to support session establishment and management. It also defines the messages for the EID to RLOC mapping registration application.

To support protocol extensibility when new applications, or extensions to existing applications are introduced, the messages are based on a TLV format.



Reliable transport message format

- \*Type: 16 bit type field identifying the message type.
- \*Length: 16 bit field that provides the total size of the message in octets including the length, type and end marker fields. The length allows the receiver to locate the next message in the TCP stream. The minimum value of the length field is 8.
- \*ID: A 32-bit value that identifies the message. May be used by the receiver to identify the message in replies or notification messages.
- \*Data: Type specific message contents.
- \*End Marker: A 32-bit message end marker that must be set to 0x9FACADE9. The End Marker is used by the receiver to validate that it has correctly parsed or skipped a message and provides a method to detect formatting errors. Note that message data may also contain this marker, and that the marker itself is not sufficient for parsing the message.

The base message format does not indicate how the peer should deal with the message in cases where the message type is not supported/understood. This is best dealt with by the application. For example, in case an error notification is returned, or an expected acknowledgement message is not received, the application might choose various courses of action; from simply logging that the feature is not supported, all the way to tearing the relationship with the peer down for the feature, or for all LISP features.

## 4. Session Establishment

To ensure backwards compatibility, the Map-Server and ETR MUST communicate via unreliable UDP messages until a reliable session between the two can be successfully established.

The ETR indicates its intent to use a reliable transport setting the Reliable Transport bit in the UDP Map-Register message. As an acknowledgement, when the MS is ready to accept the establishment of a reliable transport session it also sets the Reliable Transport bit in the Map-Notify message. The Reliable Transport bit is specified below in [Section 4.1](#).

The Map-Server authenticates the ETR with the authentication data contained in the first UDP Map-Register message it receives from the ETR. Once the ETR is authenticated, the Map-Server performs a passive open by listening on TCP port 4342, and does not qualify the remote port. As a security measure, the Map-Server does not create any connection unless a UDP authentication, with the r bit set, completes first. After that, the Map-Server accepts connections only from those ETRs that have been authenticated via UDP Map-Register messages. Note that the use of TCP here is for documentation purposes, [Section 4.2](#) lists the alternatives that can be used to sustain the reliable transport session.

The ETR assumes the active role of the TCP session establishment by connecting to the Map-Server once it has received a UDP Map-Notify message with the Reliable Transport bit set. ETR MUST assume the client role and it is always the one attempting the connection.

When a TCP session goes down, UDP authentication must take place before a new TCP session is established. The Map-Server will not accept a connection from the ETR until a UDP Map-Register with the Reliable Transport bit set has been received. Similarly, the ETR will not attempt to establish a session with the Map-Server until an UDP map-notify message has been received with the Reliable Transport bit set.


A single reliable transport session is established between the Map-Server and the ETR to cover all communication needs. For example, an ETR that has EID prefix registrations for multiple EID instances and EID address families will only establish a single session with the Map-Server.

### 4.1. Signaling to Trigger Session Establishment

Following the procedures described in this document, the Map-Register and Map-Notify headers are extended with a new flag, the Reliable Transport bit, that is used to advertise intent to


establish a reliable transport session (ETR), as well as the capability to accept reliable transport sessions (MS).

The Map-Register header, as defined in [[RFC9301](#)] is extended with an additional field, the Reliable Transport bit.



r: This is the Reliable Transport bit in the Map-Register header. It should be set to 1 when the ETR that sends a registration intends to establish a reliable transport session with the MS that the registration is being sent to.

The Map-Notify header, as defined in [[RFC9301](#)], is extended with an additional field, the Reliable Transport bit.



r: This is the Reliable Transport bit in the Map-Notify header. It should be set to 1 when the MS has validated an initial UDP registration and acknowledges the possibility to use a reliable transport session with the ETR.

#### 4.2. Transport Protocol and Port Usage


This document defines TCP as transport protocol that can be used to sustain a reliable transport between ETRs and the MS:

TCP [[RFC0793](#)]: This is the reference protocol used as a base for documentation of this specification. The port 4342 is used for this purpose (see [Section 8.2](#)). TCP sessions are long-lived and maintained unless one of the endpoints closes or resets the session, or the communication times out and needs to be restarted.

#### 5. Error Notifications

The error notification message is used to communicate base reliable transport session communication errors. LISP applications making use of the reliable transport session and having to communicate application specific errors must define their own messages to do so. An error notification is issued when the receiver of a message does not recognize the message type or cannot parse the message contents.

The notification includes the offending message type and ID and as much of the offending message data as the notification sender wishes to.



Error Notification message format

\*Error Code: An 8 bit field identifying the type of error that occurred. Defined errors are:

- Unrecognized message type.
- Message format error.

\*Reserved: Set to zero by the sender and ignored by the receiver.

\*Offending Message Type: 16 bit type field identifying the message type of the offending message that triggered this error notification. This is copied from the Type field of the offending message.

\*Offending Message Length: 16 bit field that provides the total size of the offending message in octets. This is copied from the Length field of the offending message.

\*Offending Message ID: A 32-bit field that is set to the Message ID field of the offending message.

\*Offending Message Data: The Data from the offending message that triggered this error notification. The sender of the notification may include as much of the original data as is deemed necessary. The length of the Offending Message Data field is not provided by the Offending Message Length field and is determined by

subtracting the size of the other fields in the message from the Length field. It is valid to not include any of the offending message data when sending an error notification.

\*End Marker: A 32-bit message end marker that must be set to 0x9FACADE9. The End Marker is used by the receiver to validate that it has correctly parsed or skipped a message and provides a method to detect formatting errors. Note that message data may also contain this marker, and that the marker itself is not sufficient for parsing the message.

An error notification cannot be the offending message in another error notification and MUST NOT trigger such a message.

## **6. EID Prefix Registration**

EID prefix registration uses the reliable transport session between an ETR and a Map-Server to communicate the ETR local EID database EID to RLOC mappings to the Map-Server. In contrast to the UDP based periodic registration, mapping information over the reliable transport session is only sent when there is new information available for the Map-Server. The Map-Server does not maintain a timer to expire registrations communicated over the reliable transport session. Instead an explicit de-registration (a registration carrying a zero TTL) is needed to delete the state maintained by the Map-Server.

The key used to identify registration mapping records in the ETR to Map-Server communication is the EID prefix. The prefix may be specified using an LCAF encoding that includes an EID instance ID.

When the reliable transport session goes down, registration mappings learned by the Map-Server are treated as periodic UDP registrations and a timer is used to expire them after 3 minutes. During this period UDP based registrations or the re-establishment of the reliable transport session and subsequent communication of a new mapping can update the EID prefix mapping state.

### **6.1. Reliable Mapping Registration Messages**

This section defines the LISP reliable transport session messages used to communicate local EID database registrations between the ETR and the Map-Server.


#### **6.1.1. Registration Message**

The reliable transport registration message is used to communicate EID to RLOC mapping registrations from the ETR to the Map-Server. To increase code reuse, the "Message Data" field uses the same format as the UDP Map-Registers but without the IP and UDP headers. A



reliable registration message MUST contain a single mapping-record. The Map-Server MUST discard any reliable registration message that contains more than one mapping record.

The reliable transport session is authenticated by means of the session establishment procedure. Thus, although the Map-Register MUST carry the authentication data, it is up to the Map-Server to determine if each individual reliable registration message should be authenticated.



Registration message format

**6.1.2. Registration Acknowledgement Message**

The Acknowledgement message is sent from the Map-Server to the ETR to confirm successful registration of an EID prefix previously communicated by a reliable transport session Registration message. The Registration Acknowledgement message does not carry a mapping record (the Map-Servers view of the mapping). This is accomplished by the LISP reliable transport Map Notification message.



Registration Acknowledgement message format


\*Prefix-Length: Mask length for the EID prefix.

\*EID-Prefix AFI: Address family identifier for the EID prefix in the following field.

\*EID-Prefix: The EID prefix from the received Registration.

### 6.1.3. Registration Rejection Message

The Registration Rejection Message is sent by the Map-Server to the ETR to indicate that the registration of a specific EID prefix is being rejected or withdrawn. A rejection refers to a recently-sent registration that is being immediately rejected. A withdrawal refers to a previously accepted registration that is no longer acceptable, perhaps due to a configuration change in the Map-Server. The ETR must keep track of rejected EID prefixes and be prepared to re-register their mappings when requested through a registration refresh message.



Registration Rejection message format

\*Reason: Code identifying the reason for which the Map-Server rejected or withdrew the registration.

- 1 - Not a valid site EID prefix.
- 2 - Authentication failure.
- 3 - Locator set not allowed.
- 4 - Used to cover reason that's not defined.

\*Reserved: This field is reserved for future use. Set to zero by the sender and ignored by the receiver.


\*Prefix-Length: Mask length for the EID prefix.

\*EID-Prefix-AFI: Address family identifier for the EID prefix in the following field.

\*EID-Prefix: The EID prefix being rejected or withdrawn.

#### 6.1.1.4. Registration Refresh Message

Sent by the Map-Server to the ETR to request the (re-)transmission of EID prefix database mapping Registration messages.



Registration Refresh message format

\*Scope: Determines the set of registrations being refreshed.

-0 - All prefixes under all address families under all EID instances are being refreshed. When using this scope the Prefix-Length, EID-Prefix-AFI, and EID-Prefix fields MUST be omitted. That is, the Message End Marker follows immediately after the Reserved field. The total length of the message MUST be 15 bytes.

-1 - All prefixes under all address families under a single EID instance are being refreshed. The Prefix-Length MUST be set to zero, EID-Prefix-AFI MUST be set to LCAF type, the EID-Prefix encodes the LCAF Instance ID, the LCAF address AFI MUST be set to UNSPECIFIED. The total length of the message MUST be 30 bytes.

-2 - All prefixes under a single address family under a single EID instance are being refreshed. The Prefix-Length MUST be set to zero, the EID-Prefix-AFI MUST be set to LCAF type and the EID-Prefix MUST encode the Instance ID. The LCAF address AFI MUST specify the address family to refresh, the actual address SHOULD be set to zero.

-3 - All prefixes covered by a specific EID prefix in a single EID instance is being refreshed. The Prefix-Length, EID-Prefix-AFI and EID prefix MUST be encoded accordingly.

-4 - A specific EID prefix in a single EID instance is being refreshed. The Prefix-Length, EID-Prefix-AFI and EID prefix MUST be encoded accordingly.

The Map-Server has the flexibility to control the granularity of the refresh by issuing refresh with different scopes. It can send a single refresh with a coarse scope or send individual refreshes with narrower scope. The ETR MUST be able to process all scopes to ensure the Map-Server registration states are synchronized with the ETR.

\*R: Request from the ETR to only refresh registrations that have been previously rejected by the Map-Server. If the R bit is set then the scope cannot have a value of 3 and the EID-Prefix and Prefix-Length fields must be omitted.

\*Reserved: This field is reserved for future use. Set to zero by the sender and ignored by the receiver.


\*Prefix-Length: Mask length for the EID prefix. Refer to scope for more details.

\*EID-Prefix-AFI: Address family identifier for the EID prefix in the following field. Refer to scope for more details.

\*EID-Prefix: The EID prefix being refreshed. Refer to scope for more details.

#### **6.1.5. Mapping Notification Message**

Mapping Notification messages communicate the Map-Server view of the mapping for an EID prefix and no longer serve as a registration acknowledgement. Mapping Notifications do not need message level authentication as they are received over a reliable transport session to a known Map-Server. Note that reliable transport Mapping Notification messages do not reuse the UDP Map-Notify message format.



Mapping Notification message format

\*xTR-ID: xTR-ID taken from the last valid registration the Map-Server received for the EID-prefix conveyed in the mapping record.

\*site-ID: site-ID taken from the last valid registration the Map-Server received for the EID-prefix conveyed in the mapping record.

\*Mapping Record: Mapping record of the EID-prefix the Map-Server is conveying to the ETR.

**6.2. ETR Behavior**

The ETR operates the following per EID prefix, per MS state machine that defines the reliable transport EID prefix registration behavior.

There are five states:

\*No state: The local EID database prefix does not exist.

\*Periodic: The local EID database prefix is being periodically registered through UDP Map-Register messages as specified in [].

\*Stable: From the ETR's perspective, no registrations are due to be sent to the peer. The session to the peer is up, and the peer has either acknowledged the registration, or is expected to request a refresh in the future.

\*AckWait: A Registration message for the prefix has been transmitted to the Map-Server and the ETR is waiting for either a Registration Acknowledge or Registration Rejected reply from the Map-Server.

\*Reject: The reliable transport registration for the local EID database prefix was rejected by the Map-Server. From the ETR's perspective, no registration is due to the peer AND the peer is known to have rejected the registration.

The following events drive the state transitions:

\*DB creation: The local EID database entry for the EID prefix is created.

\*DB deletion: The local EID database entry for the EID prefix is deleted.

\*DB change: The mapping contents or authentication information for the local EID database entry changes.

\*Session up: The reliable transport session to the Map-Server is established.

\*Session down: The reliable transport session the Map-Server goes down.

\*Recv Refresh: A Registration refresh message is received from the Map-Server.

\*Recv ACK: A Registration Acknowledge message is received from the Map-Server.

\*Recv Rejected: A Registration Rejected message is received from the Map-Server.

\*Periodic timer: The timer that drives generation of periodic UDP Map-Register messages fires.

The state machine is:

Event	Prev State	
	No state	Periodic
DB creation [session down]	-> Periodic A1	N/A
DB creation [session up]	-> AckWait A2	N/A
DB deletion	N/A	-> No state A3
DB change	N/A	- A1
Session up	-	-> Stable A4
Session down	-	N/A
Recv Refresh	-	N/A
Recv Refresh [rejected]	-	N/A
Recv ACK	-	N/A
Recv Rejection	-	N/A
Timer	N/A	- A5

xTR per EID prefix per MS state machine

Event	Prev State		
	Stable	AckWait	Rejected
DB creation	N/A	N/A	N/A
DB deletion	-> No state A6	-> No state A6	-> No state
DB change	-> AckWait A2	- A2	-> AckWait A2
Session up	N/A	N/A	N/A
Session down	-> Periodic A7	-> Periodic A7	-> Periodic A7
Recv Refresh	-> AckWait A2	- A2	-> AckWait A2
Recv Refresh [rejected]	-	- A2	-> AckWait A2
Recv ACK	-	-> Stable	-> AckWait A2
Recv Rejection	-> Rejected	-> Rejected	-
Timer	N/A	N/A	N/A

xTR per EID prefix per MS state machine

Action descriptions:

\*A1: Start periodic registration timer with zero delay.

\*A2: Send Registration over reliable transport session.

\*A3: Send UDP registration with zero TTL.

\*A4: Stop periodic registration timer.



\*A7: Send UDP registration and start periodic registration timer with registration period.

\*A6: Send Registration with TTL zero over reliable transport session.

\*A7: Start periodic registration timer with registration period.

All timer start actions must be jittered.

When the reliable transport session is established the ETR moves the state machine into the Stable state without first registering the EID prefix over the reliable transport session. The Map-Server will send a refresh message with a scope of 0 that will trigger the registration message to be sent. Because other applications may be using the reliable session, the refresh message signals the ETR that the Map-Server supports reliable map registration messages. This model will also allow future optimizations where the Map-Server may retain registration state from a previous instantiation of the reliable transport session with the ETR and only request the refresh of EID prefix state beyond some negotiated session progress marker.

Aa Map-Server authentication key change is treated as a DB change event and will result in triggering a new Registration message to be transmitted.

### **6.3. Map-Server Behavior**

Received registrations create/update or delete mapping state.

A refresh with global scope is sent when a session between the ETR and Map-Server is first established so the Map-Server can obtain the complete database contents from the ETR. This refresh is also serving as a capability signaling from the Map-Server to the ETR that it can support reliable registration.

Refresh for rejected registrations sent (R bit set) when a new EID prefix is configured on the Map-Server.

Refresh is sent whenever authentication key is changed or EID prefix is deconfigured. Upon reception of the registration Map-Server can decide whether to acknowledge the registration or issue rejection.

Mapping Notification message sent whenever the mapping for a registered or more specific prefix for which notifications are requested changes. ETR acknowledgement or rejection messaging for Mapping Notification is not required because the ETR decides how to process the message based on the registered mapping information. If the mapping information changes the resulting registration will trigger a new Mapping Notification message from the Map-Server.

## 7. Security Considerations

The LISP reliable transport session SHOULD be authenticated. On controlled RLOC networks that can guarantee that the source RLOC address of data packets cannot be spoofed, the authentication check can be a source address validation on the reliable transport packets. When the RLOC network does not provide such guarantees, reliable transport authentication SHOULD be used. Implementations SHOULD support the TCP Authentication Option (TCP-AO) [RFC5925].

## 8. IANA Considerations

### 8.1. LISP Reliable Transport Message Types

Assignment of new LISP reliable transport message types is done according to the "IETF Review" model defined in [[RFC5266](#)].

The initial content of the registry should be as follows.

Type	Name	Reference
0-15	Reserved	This document
16	Error Notification	This document
17	Registration Message	This document
18	Registration Acknowledgement Message	This document
19	Registration Rejected Message	This document
20	Registration Refresh Message	This document
21	Mapping Notification Message	This document
22-30	Reserved for EID membership distribution	TBD
31-64999	Unassigned	
65000-65535	Reserved for Experimental Use	

### 8.2. Transport Protocol Port Numbers

Following the guidelines of [RFC8126], the authors request IANA is to assign a TCP port (4342 is suggested) to sustain reliable transport over TCP.

## 9. Contributors

Jesus Arango  
Microsoft  
United States of America

Email: [jearango@microsoft.com](mailto:jearango@microsoft.com)

Johnson Leong  
Uber Technologies  
Market St.  
San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

## 10. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Noel Chiappa, Dino Farinacci, Jesper Skriver, Andre Pelletier, Les Ginsberg and Alberto Rodriguez-Natal for their contributions to this document.

## 11. 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>>.
- [RFC5266] Devarapalli, V. and P. Eronen, "Secure Connectivity and Mobility Using Mobile IPv4 and IKEv2 Mobility and Multihoming (MOBIKE)", BCP 136, RFC 5266, DOI 10.17487/RFC5266, June 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5266>>.
- [RFC9301] Farinacci, D., Maino, F., Fuller, V., and A. Cabellos, Ed., "Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP) Control Plane", RFC 9301, DOI 10.17487/RFC9301, October 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9301>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Balaji Pitta  
Cisco Systems  
Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
United States of America

Email: [bvenkata@cisco.com](mailto:bvenkata@cisco.com)

Marc Portoles  
Cisco Systems  
Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
United States of America

Email: [mportole@cisco.com](mailto:mportole@cisco.com)

Darrel Lewis  
ICANN  
Los Angeles, CA 90292  
United States of America

Email: [darrel.lewis@icann.org](mailto:darrel.lewis@icann.org)

Isidor Kouvelas  
Arista Networks Inc.  
5453 Great America Parkway  
Santa Clara, CA 95054  
United States of America

Email: [isidor@kouvelas.net](mailto:isidor@kouvelas.net)

Chris Cassar  
Rivian Automotive  
United Kingdom

Email: [christiancassar@acm.org](mailto:christiancassar@acm.org)