

Updating LSP Ping IANA registries

draft-andersson-mpis-lsp-ping-registries-update

Loa Andersson

Tarek Saad

Mach Chen

Background

- RFC 4379
 - Defined the registry structure
- RFC 8029
 - Changed some registry entries
 - Not all of it go into the IANA registries
- RFC 8126
 - The rules for IANA registries
- RFC 8166
 - We tried to create the new registry as it is defined in RFC 8039

RFC 4379

- The original MPLS LSP Ping and Traceroute RFC
 - Technically a solid document
 - There are some issues with the IANA registries
- RFC 4379 says:
 - ‘Values from "[Specification Required](#)" ranges MUST be registered with IANA. The request MUST be made via an [Experimental RFC](#) that describes the format and procedures for using the code point; the actual assignment is made during the IANA actions for the RFC.’
- This is not wrong, but a bit odd. (Part of) the motivation was that we wanted “Experimental Codepoints”.
 - Only that the code points assigned from an Experimental RFC are not “Experimental”, they are plain ordinary code points free for anyone to use.

The IANA registry a'la RFC 4379

The typical Registration Procedures that was generated based on original the statement about the experimental RFC looks like this:

| Range | Registration Procedures | Note |
|-------|-------------------------|------|
|-------|-------------------------|------|

| | | |
|-------|------------------|--|
| 0-191 | Standards Action | |
|-------|------------------|--|

| | | |
|---------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 192-251 | Specification Required | Experimental RFC needed |
|---------|------------------------|-------------------------|

Every document that might be considered a "specification"

Designated Experts needed

Only four IETF documents

Designated Experts not needed

RFC 8029

- The original MPLS LSP Ping and Traceroute RFC
 - Technically a solid document
 - There are some issues with the IANA registries
- RFC 8029 says:

‘Values from "Specification Required" ranges MUST be registered with IANA. The request MUST be made via an [RFC](#) that describes the format and procedures for using the code point; the actual assignment is made during the IANA actions for the RFC.’
- This is not wrong, but a bit odd.

The IANA registry a'la RFC 80209

The typical Registration Procedures that was generated by the statement about an RFC would have looked like this:

| Range | Registration Procedures |
|-------|-------------------------|
|-------|-------------------------|

| | |
|-------|------------------|
| 0-191 | Standards Action |
|-------|------------------|

| | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| 192-251 | Specification Required RFC needed |
|---------|-------------------------------------|

Every document that might be considered a "specification"

Designated Experts needed

All IETF documents

Designated Experts not needed

But it never got into the IANA registries

One more thing!

This:

| Range | Registration Procedures | Note |
|---------|-------------------------|------------|
| 0-191 | Standards Action | |
| 192-251 | Specification Required | RFC needed |

Is actually identical to:

| Range | Registration Procedures | Note |
|---------|-------------------------|------|
| 0-191 | Standards Action | |
| 192-251 | RFC Required | |

RFC Required

- RFC Required is one of 10 Registration Procedures defined in RFC 8126.
 1. Private Use
 2. Experimental Use
 3. Hierarchical Allocation
 4. First Come First Served
 5. Expert Review
 6. Specification Required
 7. RFC Required
 8. IETF Review
 9. Standards Action
 10. IESG Approval

The updates made

The updates the document makes to the LSP Ping IANA registries

- Align with the concepts used in RFC 8126
- Add Code Points for Experimental use
- Explicitly list all Registration Procedures

The registries will look this!

| Range | Registration Procedures | Note |
|---------|-------------------------|------|
| 0-191 | Standards Action | |
| 192-247 | RFC Required | |
| 248-251 | Experimental Use | |
| 252-255 | Private Use | |

Next steps

- WG read and comment
- Discuss and update
- Request adoption as a WG document in the Singapore timeframe