

LISP Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Experimental  
Expires: October 1, 2021

A. Rodriguez-Natal  
Cisco  
V. Ermagan  
Google  
A. Smirnov  
V. Ashtaputre  
Cisco  
D. Farinacci  
lispers.net  
March 30, 2021

**Vendor Specific LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF)**  
**draft-ietf-lisp-vendor-lcaf-09**

Abstract

This document describes a new LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF), the Vendor Specific LCAF. This LCAF enables organizations to have internal encodings for LCAF addresses.

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 October 1, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 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 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> | Introduction . . . . .            | <a href="#">2</a> |
| <a href="#">2.</a> | Requirements Notation . . . . .   | <a href="#">2</a> |
| <a href="#">3.</a> | Vendor Specific LCAF . . . . .    | <a href="#">2</a> |
| <a href="#">4.</a> | Security Considerations . . . . . | <a href="#">4</a> |
| <a href="#">5.</a> | Acknowledgments . . . . .         | <a href="#">4</a> |
| <a href="#">6.</a> | IANA Considerations . . . . .     | <a href="#">4</a> |
| <a href="#">7.</a> | Normative References . . . . .    | <a href="#">4</a> |
|                    | Authors' Addresses . . . . .      | <a href="#">5</a> |

## [1.](#) Introduction

The LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) [[RFC8060](#)] defines the format and encoding for different address types that can be used on LISP [[I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis](#)] [[I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis](#)] deployments. However, certain deployments require specific format encodings that may not be applicable outside of the use-case for which they are defined. The Vendor Specific LCAF allows organizations to create LCAF addresses to be used only internally on particular LISP deployments.

## [2.](#) Requirements Notation

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## [3.](#) Vendor Specific LCAF

The Vendor Specific LCAF relies on using the IEEE Organizationally Unique Identifier (OUI) [[IEEE.802.2001](#)] to prevent collisions across vendors or organizations using the LCAF. The format of the Vendor Specific LCAF is provided below.



```

      0              1              2              3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           AFI = 16387           |   Rsvd1   |   Flags   |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|   Type = 255   |   Rsvd2   |           Length           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|   Rsvd3   |   Organizationally Unique Identifier (OUI)   |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           Internal format...           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

### Vendor Specific LCAF

The fields in the first 8 octets of the above Vendor Specific LCAF are actually the fields defined in the general LCAF format specified in [RFC8060]. The "Type" field MUST be set to the value 255 to indicate that this is a Vendor Specific LCAF. The Length field has to be set accordingly to the length of the internal format plus the OUI plus the Rsvd3 fields as for [RFC8060]. The fields defined by the Vendor Specific LCAF are:

Rsvd3: This 8-bit field is reserved for future use. It MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Organizationally Unique Identifier (OUI): This is a 24-bit field that carries the IEEE OUI [IEEE.802.2001] of the organization.

Internal format: This is a variable length field that is left undefined on purpose. Each vendor or organization can define its own internal format(s) to use with the Vendor Specific LCAF.

The Vendor Specific LCAF type SHOULD NOT be used in deployments where different organizations interoperate. However, there may be cases where two (or more) organizations share a common deployment on which they explicitly and mutually agree to use a particular Vendor Specific LCAF. In that case, the organizations involved need to carefully assess the interoperability concerns for that particular deployment.

If a LISP device receives a LISP message containing a Vendor Specific LCAF with an OUI that it does not understand, it MUST drop the message and it SHOULD create a log message.



#### 4. Security Considerations

This document enables organizations to define new LCAFs for their internal use. It is the responsibility of these organizations to properly assess the security implications of the formats they define.

#### 5. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Joel Halpern and Luigi Iannone for their suggestions and guidance regarding this document.

#### 6. IANA Considerations

Following the guidelines of [RFC8126], this document requests IANA to update the "LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) Types" Registry defined in [RFC8060] to allocate the following assignment:

| Value # | LISP LCAF Type Name | Reference                 |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 255     | Vendor Specific     | <a href="#">Section 3</a> |

Table 1: Vendor Specific LCAF assignment

#### 7. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis]

Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., Meyer, D., Lewis, D., and A. Cabellos-Aparicio, "The Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP)", [draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis-36](#) (work in progress), November 2020.

[I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis]

Farinacci, D., Maino, F., Fuller, V., and A. Cabellos-Aparicio, "Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP) Control-Plane", [draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis-30](#) (work in progress), November 2020.

[IEEE.802\_2001]

IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Overview and Architecture", IEEE 802-2001, DOI 10.1109/ieeestd.2002.93395, July 2002, <<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/servlet/opac?punumber=7732>>.



- [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>>.
- [RFC8060] Farinacci, D., Meyer, D., and J. Snijders, "LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF)", [RFC 8060](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8060, February 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8060>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Alberto Rodriguez-Natal  
Cisco  
San Jose, CA  
USA

Email: natal@cisco.com

Vina Ermagan  
Google  
USA

Email: ermagan@gmail.com

Anton Smirnov  
Cisco  
Diegem  
Belgium

Email: asmirnov@cisco.com



Vrushali Ashtaputre  
Cisco  
San Jose, CA  
USA

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

Dino Farinacci  
lispers.net  
San Jose, CA  
USA

Email: [farinacci@gmail.com](mailto:farinacci@gmail.com)

