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1. Introduction

This draft documents the LISP messages and protocol procedures for a simple mechanism for the NAT Traversal problem. A subset of message definitions and protocol procedures are taken from [I-D.ermagan-lisp-nat-traversal]. This design was first implemented in the lispers.net LISP implementation dating back to January 2014.

The procedures described in this document are performed by LISP compliant [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] xTRs that reside on the private side of one or more NAT devices that connect them to the public side of the network.

The solution is applicable to the following xTR deployments:

- A physical ITR/ETR device that is directly connected or multiple hops away from a NAT device.
- A LISP-MN acting as an ITR/ETR device on an cellular service where a mobile provider is providing a NAT function.
- A logical ITR/ETR that resides in a VM that is behind a NAT device managed by a hypervisor or cloud provider.
o A logical ITR/ETR that resides in a container where a NAT function is provided by the container service.

o The above xTR deployments can operate through multiple levels of NATs.

o The above deployments are also applicable to RTR and PxTR devices that may reside behind NAT devices.

o The lispers.net lig [RFC6835] implementation uses the protocol messaging defined in this draft so any system behind a NAT (either running as a LISP xTR or not running LISP at all), can query the mapping system to obtain mappings for network maintenance and troubleshooting.
2. Definition of Terms

Routing Locator (RLOC): an RLOC address is a routable address on the public Internet. It is used by LISP to locate where EIDs are topologically located and appears in the outer header of LISP encapsulated packets. With respect to this design, an RLOC can be a private or public address. Private RLOCs can be registered to the LISP mapping system so they can be used by other LISP xTRs which reside in the same private network. Public RLOCs can be registered to the LISP mapping system and are used by LISP xTRs that are on the public side of the network.

Network Address Translator (NAT): is a router type device that isolates a private network from a public network. The addresses used on the private side of a network are known as private addresses and are not routable on the public side of the network. Therefore, a NAT device must translate private addresses to public addresses. In this document, xTRs that reside on the private side of the network use private RLOCs. These RLOCs must be translated to public addresses so they can be registered in the LISP mapping system.

Private RLOC: is the IP address of the interface of an xTR that faces outbound towards a NAT device. This address is typically translated to a public RLOC address before the packet appears on the public side of the network.

Ephemeral Port: is the UDP source port in a LISP data-plane or control-plane message. This address is typically translated by a NAT device when the packet goes from the private side of the NAT device to the public side of the network.

Global RLOC: is an address that has been translated by a NAT device. The Private RLOC is translated to a Global RLOC and is registered to the mapping system. This RLOC will be the source address in LISP encapsulated packets on the public side of the network.

Translated Port: is the Ephemeral Port that is translated by a NAT device. For an xTR outgoing packet, the source Ephemeral Port is translated to a source Translated Port seen by the public side of the network. For an incoming packet, the NAT device translates the destination Translated Port to the destination Ephemeral Port.

Re-encapsulating Tunnel Router (RTR): is a LISP network element that receives a LISP encapsulated packet, strips the outer header and prepends a new outer header. With respect to this NAT-Traversal design, an ITR (either behind a NAT device or on the public network) encapsulates a packet to the RTR’s RLOC address. The RTR
strips this ITR prepended header and thenprepends a its own new outer header and sends packet to the RLOC address of an ETR that registered the EID that appears as the destination address from the inner header.

NAT Info Cache: is a data structure managed by an RTR to track xTR hostname, Global RLOC and Translated Port information. The RTR uses this table so it knows what is the destination port to be used for LISP encapsulated packets that much travel through a NAT device.

Address Family Identifier (AFI): a term used to describe an address encoding in a packet [AFI] and [RFC1700]. All LISP control messages use AFI encoded addresses. The AFI value is 16-bits in length and precedes all LISP encoded addresses. In this document, the design calls for AFI encodings for IPv4 and IPv6 addresses as well as Distinguished-Name [I-D.farinacci-lisp-name-encoding] and LCAF [RFC8060] address formats.
3. Overview

The following sequence of actions describes at a high-level how the lispers.net implementation performs NAT-Traversal and is the basis for a simplified NAT-Traversal protocol design.

1. An xTR sends a Info-Request message to port 4342 to its configured Map-Servers so it can get a list of RTRs to be used for NAT-Traversal.

2. The Map-Servers return an Info-Reply message with the list of RTRs.

3. The xTR then sends an Info-Request message to port 4341 to each RTR.

4. Each RTR caches the translated RLOC address and port in a NAT Info Cache. At this point, the NAT device has created state to allow the RTR to send encapsulated packets from port 4341 to the translated port.

5. The RTR returns an Info-Reply message so the xTR can learn its translated Global RLOC address and Translated Port.

6. The xTR registers its EID-prefixes with an RLOC-set that contains all its global RLOCs as well as the list of RTRs it has learned from Info-Reply messages.

7. The Map-Servers are configured to proxy Map-Reply for these registered EID-prefixes.

8. When a remote ITR sends a Map-Request for an EID that matches one of these EID-prefixes, the Map-Server returns a partial RLOC-set which contain only the list of RTRs. The remote ITR encapsulates packets to the RTRs.

9. When one of the RTRs send a Map-Request for an EID that matches one of these EID-prefixes, the Map-Server returns a partial RLOC-set which contain only the global RLOCs so the RTR can encapsulate packets that will make it through the NAT device to the xTR.

10. The xTR behind a NAT device only stores default map-cache entries with an RLOC-set that contain the list of RTRs the Map-Server supplied it with. The xTR load-splits traffic across the RTRs based on the 5-tuple hash algorithm detailed in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis].
4. Protocol Messages

The lispers.net implementation uses the Info-Request and Info-Reply messages from [I-D.ermagan-lisp-nat-traversal] as well as the NAT-Traversal LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) from [RFC8060].

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Type=7  | 0 |           Reserved                  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|               Nonce . . .                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   . . . Nonce                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                          Key ID                          | Authentication Data Length |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Authentication Data                                                  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                          TTL                              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Reserved    |   EID mask-len  | EID-prefix-AFI                     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| EID-prefix                                                                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| AFI = 0                  | <Nothing Follows AFI=0>                   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

LISP Info-Request Message Format

The lispers.net implementation will send an Info-Request message to each configured Map-Server. The message is sent to UDP destination port 4342 which is the control-plane port for LISP [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] from a UDP ephemeral source port. The source address is its Private RLOC. When the xTR is multi-homed to more than one NAT device, it sends the Info-Request on all interfaces facing NAT devices.

A randomized 64-bit nonce is selected for the message and no authentication is used. The EID-prefix AFI is 17 according to the encoding format in [I-D.farinacci-lisp-name-encoding] and the EID-prefix is the hostname of the xTR encoded as a string null terminated.

An Info-Request is sent out each outgoing interface, with the address of that interface as the Private RLOC, leading to a NAT device. The port pair in the UDP message is the same for each outgoing interface.
When the xTR receives an Info-Reply message from the Map-Server in response to this control-plane Info-Request, it caches a list of RTRs from the Info-Reply. If the list of RTRs are different from each Map-Server, the lists are merged. The xTR stores the merged list as the RLOC-set for 4 default map-cache entries. The map-cache entries have the following EID-prefixes:

IPv4 unicast: 0.0.0.0/0
IPv4 multicast: (0.0.0.0/0, 224.0.0.0/4)
IPv6 unicast: 0::/0
IPv6 multicast: (0::/0, ff00::/8)

Now that the xTR has a list of RTRs, it sends a data-plane Info-Request to each RTR to UDP destination port 4341 from a UDP ephemeral source port. The data-plane Info-Request is sent out each interface just like the control-plane Info-Request was sent for the multi-homed NAT device case.
When Map-Servers and RTRs return an Info-Reply message to xTRs behind NAT devices, the format of the Info-Reply message is the following:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type=7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Reserved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... Nonce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authentication Data Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authentication Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

LISP Info-Reply Message Format

The information returned is the same information that was sent in the Info-Request message except the Info-Reply bit is set (the bit next to Type=7) and the NAT Traversal LCAF encoding is appended.

When a Map-Server returns the Info-Reply, the MS UDP Port Number and ETR UDP Port Number is set to 0. All Address fields are empty by
using AFI equal to 0. Except for the RTR RLOC address fields which the Map-Server is configured to return to xTRs behind NAT devices.

When an RTR returns the Info-Reply, the MS UDP Port Number is set to 0 and the ETR UDP Port Number is set to the UDP source port the RTR received from the Info-Request message. The Global ETR RLOC Address is set to the source address received by the RTR in the Info-Request message. All other address fields are empty by using AFI equal to 0.

5. xTR Map-Registering and Map-Server Proxy Map-Replying

EID-prefixes registered by an xTR behind a NAT include all the global RLOCs and RTR RLOCs it learns. The xTR can use the unicast priority to control ingress packet flow as described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis]. The RTR RLOCs must be registered with a unicast priority of 254 so the Map-Server can identify xTR global RLOCs from RTR RLOCs when proxy Map-Replying.

The Global RLOCs are encoded in a RLOC-record using the AFI-List LCAF encoding [RFC8060]. There are two AFI encoded addresses in the list, one being AFI=1 which encodes the IPv4 translated NAT address and other being the Distinguished-Name AFI=17 [I-D.farinacci-lisp-name-encoding] which encodes the hostname of the xTR. When the xTR is multi-homed, the hostname is appended by a unique interface name. For example, for an xTR behind a NAT that has two interfaces facing the same or two different NAT devices, the Distinguished-Name for each RLOC-record could be "dino-xtr-eth0" and "dino-xtr-eth1" for an xTR configured to be named "dino-xtr".

Encoding a Distinguished-Name in an RLOC-record is important so an RTR can use the Global RLOC registered to the mapping system with the translated port stored in its NAT Info Cache. See Section 8 for more details.

When a remote ITR sends a Map-Request for a unicast or multicast EID registered by a xTR behind a NAT, the Map-Server returns a partial RLOC-set that contains all the RTRs (RLOC-records with unicast priority 254) in the proxied Map-Reply message.

When a RTR sends a Map-Request for a unicast or multicast EID registered by a xTR behind a NAT, the Map-Server returns a partial RLOC-set that contains all the Global RLOCs of the xTR behind the NAT in the proxied Map-Reply message.
6. Packet Flow from ITR-behind-NAT to RTR

All packets received by the ITR from the private side of the NAT will use one of the 4 default map-cache entries. There is a unicast and multicast IPv4 default EID-prefix and a unicast and multicast IPv6 default EID-prefix. The RLOC-set is the same for all 4 entries. The RLOC-set contains the globally reachable RLOCs of the RTRs. 5-tuple hashing is used to load-split traffic across the RTRs. RLOC-Probing is used to avoid encapsulating to unreachable RTRs.

7. Packet Flow from Remote ITR to RTR

A remote ITR will get a list of RTRs from the mapping system in a proxy Map-Reply when it sends a Map-Request for a unicast or multicast EID that is registered by an xTR behind a NAT device. The remote ITR will load split traffic across the RTRs from the RLOC-set. Those RTRs can get packets through the NAT devices destined for the xTR behind the NAT since an Info-Request/Info-Reply exchange had already happened between the xTR behind the NAT and the list of RTRs.

There can be a reachability situation where an RTR cannot reach the xTR behind a NAT but a remote ITR may 5-tuple hash to this RTR. Which means packets can travel from the remote ITR to the RTR but then get dropped on the path from the RTR to the xTR behind the NAT. To avoid this situation, the xTR behind the NAT RLOC-probes RTRs and when they become unreachable, they are not included in the xTR registrations.

8. Packet Flow from RTR to ETR-behind-NAT

The RTR will receive a list of Global RLOCs in a proxy Map-Reply from the mapping system for the xTR behind the NAT. The RTR 5-tuple load-splits packets across the RLOC-set of Global RLOCs that can travel through one or more NAT devices along the path to the ETR behind the NAT device.

When the RTR selects a Global RLOC to encapsulate to it must select the correct Translated Port for the UDP destination port in the encapsulation header. The RTR needs to use the same Translated Address and Translated Port pair a NAT device used to translate the Info-Request message otherwise the encapsulated packet will be dropped. The NAT Info Cache contains an entry for every hostname (and optionally appended interface name), translated address and port cached when processing Info-Request messages. The RTR obtains the correct Translated Port from the NAT Info Cache by using the Global RLOC and RLOC-record hostname from the registered RLOC-set.
The RTR can test reachability for xTRs behind NATs by encapsulating RLOC-Probe requests in data packets where the UDP source port is set to 4341 and the UDP destination port is set to the Translated Port. The outer header destination address is the Global RLOC for the xTR.
9. Design Observations

The following benefits and observations can be attributed to this design:

- An ITR behind a NAT virtually runs no control-plane and a very simple data-plane. All it does is RLOC-probe the RTRs in the common RLOC-set for each default map-cache entry. And maintains a very small map-cache of 4 entries per instance-ID it supports.

- An xTR behind a NAT can tell if another xTR is behind the same set of NAT devices and use Private RLOCs to reach each other on a short-cut path. It does this by comparing the Global RLOC returned from RTRs in Info-Reply messages.

- An xTR behind a NAT is free to send a Map-Request to the mapping system for any EID to test to see if there is a direct path to the LISP site versus potentially using a sub-optimal path through an RTR. This happens when xTRs exist that are not behind NAT devices where their RLOCs are global RLOCs.

- By sending Info-Requests to Map-Servers, an xTR behind a NAT can tell if they are reachable and if those Map-Servers also act as Map-Resolvers, the xTR behind the NAT can avoid sending Map-Requests to unreachable Map-Resolvers.

- Enhanced data-plane security can be used via LISP-Crypto mechanisms detailed in [RFC8061] using this NAT-Traversal design so both unicast and multicast traffic are encrypted.

- This design allows for the minimum amount of NAT device state since only RTRs are encapsulating to ETRs behind NAT devices. Therefore, the number of ITRs sending packets to EIDs behind NAT devices is aggregated out for scale. Scale is also achieved when xTRs behind NATs roam and RLOC-set changes need to update only RTR map-caches.

- The protocol procedures in this document can be used when a LISP site has multiple xTRs each connected via separate NAT devices to the public network. Each xTR registers their Global RLOCs and RTRs with merge semantics to the mapping system so remote ITRs can load-split traffic across a merged RTR set as well as RTRs across each xTR behind different NAT devices.
10. Security Considerations

There are no security considerations at this time.

However, the lispers.net implementation can be enhanced easily to allow the same authentication xTRs use with Map-Register messages for Info-Request messages when they send to Map-Servers.

For authentication of Info-Requests to RTRs, more work is required to maintain key management associations between xTR behind NATs and RTRs. It is not trivial to make this happen with a dynamic list of RTRs that can change as the xTR behind a NAT roams to other parts of the network and desire shorter paths to RTRs.

11. IANA Considerations

The code-point values in this specification are already allocated in [AFI] or [RFC8060].
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1. Introduction

This document describes the Locator/Identifier Separation Protocol (LISP). LISP is an encapsulation protocol built around the fundamental idea of separating the topological location of a network attachment point from the node’s identity [CHIAPPA]. As a result LISP creates two namespaces: Endpoint Identifiers (EIDs), that are used to identify end-hosts (e.g., nodes or Virtual Machines) and routable Routing Locators (RLOCs), used to identify network attachment points. LISP then defines functions for mapping between the two namespaces and for encapsulating traffic originated by
devices using non-routable EIDs for transport across a network infrastructure that routes and forwards using RLOCs. LISP encapsulation uses a dynamic form of tunneling where no static provisioning is required or necessary.

LISP is an overlay protocol that separates control from Data-Plane, this document specifies the Data-Plane as well as how LISP-capable routers (Tunnel Routers) exchange packets by encapsulating them to the appropriate location. Tunnel routers are equipped with a cache, called Map-Cache, that contains EID-to-RLOC mappings. The Map-Cache is populated using the LISP Control-Plane protocol [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

LISP does not require changes to either the host protocol stack or to underlay routers. By separating the EID from the RLOC space, LISP offers native Traffic Engineering, multihoming and mobility, among other features.

Creation of LISP was initially motivated by discussions during the IAB-sponsored Routing and Addressing Workshop held in Amsterdam in October 2006 (see [RFC4984]).

This document specifies the LISP Data-Plane encapsulation and other LISP forwarding node functionality while [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] specifies the LISP control plane. LISP deployment guidelines can be found in [RFC7215] and [RFC6835] describes considerations for network operational management. Finally, [I-D.ietf-lisp-introduction] describes the LISP architecture.

This document obsoletes RFC 6830.

1.1. Scope of Applicability

LISP was originally developed to address the Internet-wide route scaling problem [RFC4984]. While there are a number of approaches of interest for that problem, as LISP as been developed and refined, a large number of other LISP uses have been found and are being used. As such, the design and development of LISP has changed so as to focus on these use cases. The common property of these uses is a large set of cooperating entities seeking to communicate over the public Internet or other large underlay IP infrastructures, while keeping the addressing and topology of the cooperating entities separate from the underlay and Internet topology, routing, and addressing.
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. Definition of Terms

Address Family Identifier (AFI): AFI is a term used to describe an address encoding in a packet. An address family that pertains to addresses found in Data-Plane headers. See [AFN] and [RFC3232] for details. An AFI value of 0 used in this specification indicates an unspecified encoded address where the length of the address is 0 octets following the 16-bit AFI value of 0.

Anycast Address: Anycast Address refers to the same IPv4 or IPv6 address configured and used on multiple systems at the same time. An EID or RLOC can be an anycast address in each of their own address spaces.

Client-side: Client-side is a term used in this document to indicate a connection initiation attempt by an end-system represented by an EID.

Egress Tunnel Router (ETR): An ETR is a router that accepts an IP packet where the destination address in the "outer" IP header is one of its own RLOCs. The router strips the "outer" header and forwards the packet based on the next IP header found. In general, an ETR receives LISP-encapsulated IP packets from the Internet on one side and sends decapsulated IP packets to site end-systems on the other side. ETR functionality does not have to be limited to a router device. A server host can be the endpoint of a LISP tunnel as well.

EID-to-RLOC Database: The EID-to-RLOC Database is a distributed database that contains all known EID-Prefix-to-RLOC mappings. Each potential ETR typically contains a small piece of the database: the EID-to-RLOC mappings for the EID-Prefixes "behind" the router. These map to one of the router’s own IP addresses that are routable on the underlay. Note that there MAY be transient conditions when the EID-Prefix for the LISP site and Locator-Set for each EID-Prefix may not be the same on all ETRs. This has no negative implications, since a partial set of Locators can be used.

EID-to-RLOC Map-Cache: The EID-to-RLOC Map-Cache is generally short-
lived, on-demand table in an ITR that stores, tracks, and is responsible for timing out and otherwise validating EID-to-RLOC mappings. This cache is distinct from the full "database" of EID-to-RLOC mappings; it is dynamic, local to the ITR(s), and relatively small, while the database is distributed, relatively static, and much more widely scoped to LISP nodes.

EID-Prefix: An EID-Prefix is a power-of-two block of EIDs that are allocated to a site by an address allocation authority. EID-Prefixes are associated with a set of RLOC addresses. EID-Prefix allocations can be broken up into smaller blocks when an RLOC set is to be associated with the larger EID-Prefix block.

End-System: An end-system is an IPv4 or IPv6 device that originates packets with a single IPv4 or IPv6 header. The end-system supplies an EID value for the destination address field of the IP header when communicating outside of its routing domain. An end-system can be a host computer, a switch or router device, or any network appliance.

Endpoint ID (EID): An EID is a 32-bit (for IPv4) or 128-bit (for IPv6) value that identifies a host. EIDs are generally only found in the source and destination address fields of the first (most inner) LISP header of a packet. The host obtains a destination EID the same way it obtains a destination address today, for example, through a Domain Name System (DNS) [RFC1034] lookup or Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) [RFC3261] exchange. The source EID is obtained via existing mechanisms used to set a host’s "local" IP address. An EID used on the public Internet MUST have the same properties as any other IP address used in that manner; this means, among other things, that it MUST be unique. An EID is allocated to a host from an EID-Prefix block associated with the site where the host is located. An EID can be used by a host to refer to other hosts. Note that EID blocks MAY be assigned in a hierarchical manner, independent of the network topology, to facilitate scaling of the mapping database. In addition, an EID block assigned to a site MAY have site-local structure (subnetting) for routing within the site; this structure is not visible to the underlay routing system. In theory, the bit string that represents an EID for one device can represent an RLOC for a different device. When used in discussions with other Locator/ID separation proposals, a LISP EID will be called an "LEID". Throughout this document, any references to "EID" refer to an LEID.

Ingress Tunnel Router (ITR): An ITR is a router that resides in a
LISP site. Packets sent by sources inside of the LISP site to destinations outside of the site are candidates for encapsulation by the ITR. The ITR treats the IP destination address as an EID and performs an EID-to-RLOC mapping lookup. The router then prepends an "outer" IP header with one of its routable RLOCs (in the RLOC space) in the source address field and the result of the mapping lookup in the destination address field. Note that this destination RLOC may be an intermediate, proxy device that has better knowledge of the EID-to-RLOC mapping closer to the destination EID. In general, an ITR receives IP packets from site end-systems on one side and sends LISP-encapsulated IP packets toward the Internet on the other side.

LISP Header: LISP header is a term used in this document to refer to the outer IPv4 or IPv6 header, a UDP header, and a LISP-specific 8-octet header that follow the UDP header and that an ITR prepends or an ETR strips.

LISP Router: A LISP router is a router that performs the functions of any or all of the following: ITR, ETR, RTR, Proxy-ITR (PITR), or Proxy-ETR (PETR).

LISP Site: LISP site is a set of routers in an edge network that are under a single technical administration. LISP routers that reside in the edge network are the demarcation points to separate the edge network from the core network.

Locator-Status-Bits (LSBs): Locator-Status-Bits are present in the LISP header. They are used by ITRs to inform ETRs about the up/down status of all ETRs at the local site. These bits are used as a hint to convey up/down router status and not path reachability status. The LSBs can be verified by use of one of the Locator reachability algorithms described in Section 10. An ETR MUST rate-limit the action it takes when it detects changes in the Locator-Status-Bits.

Proxy-ETR (PETR): A PETR is defined and described in [RFC6832]. A PETR acts like an ETR but does so on behalf of LISP sites that send packets to destinations at non-LISP sites.

Proxy-ITR (PITR): A PITR is defined and described in [RFC6832]. A PITR acts like an ITR but does so on behalf of non-LISP sites that send packets to destinations at LISP sites.

Recursive Tunneling: Recursive Tunneling occurs when a packet has
more than one LISP IP header. Additional layers of tunneling MAY be employed to implement Traffic Engineering or other re-routing as needed. When this is done, an additional "outer" LISP header is added, and the original RLOCs are preserved in the "inner" header.

Re-Encapsulating Tunneling Router (RTR): An RTR acts like an ETR to remove a LISP header, then acts as an ITR to prepend a new LISP header. This is known as Re-encapsulating Tunneling. Doing this allows a packet to be re-routed by the RTR without adding the overhead of additional tunnel headers. When using multiple mapping database systems, care must be taken to not create re-encapsulation loops through misconfiguration.

Route-Returnability: Route-returnability is an assumption that the underlying routing system will deliver packets to the destination. When combined with a nonce that is provided by a sender and returned by a receiver, this limits off-path data insertion. A route-returnability check is verified when a message is sent with a nonce, another message is returned with the same nonce, and the destination of the original message appears as the source of the returned message.

Routing Locator (RLOC): An RLOC is an IPv4 [RFC0791] or IPv6 [RFC8200] address of an Egress Tunnel Router (ETR). An RLOC is the output of an EID-to-RLOC mapping lookup. An EID maps to zero or more RLOCs. Typically, RLOCs are numbered from blocks that are assigned to a site at each point to which it attaches to the underlay network; where the topology is defined by the connectivity of provider networks. Multiple RLOCs can be assigned to the same ETR device or to multiple ETR devices at a site.

Server-side: Server-side is a term used in this document to indicate that a connection initiation attempt is being accepted for a destination EID.

xTR: An xTR is a reference to an ITR or ETR when direction of data flow is not part of the context description. "xTR" refers to the router that is the tunnel endpoint and is used synonymously with the term "Tunnel Router". For example, "An xTR can be located at the Customer Edge (CE) router" indicates both ITR and ETR functionality at the CE router.
4. Basic Overview

One key concept of LISP is that end-systems operate the same way they do today. The IP addresses that hosts use for tracking sockets and connections, and for sending and receiving packets, do not change. In LISP terminology, these IP addresses are called Endpoint Identifiers (EIDs).

Routers continue to forward packets based on IP destination addresses. When a packet is LISP encapsulated, these addresses are referred to as Routing Locators (RLOCs). Most routers along a path between two hosts will not change; they continue to perform routing/forwarding lookups on the destination addresses. For routers between the source host and the ITR as well as routers from the ETR to the destination host, the destination address is an EID. For the routers between the ITR and the ETR, the destination address is an RLOC.

Another key LISP concept is the "Tunnel Router". A Tunnel Router prepends LISP headers on host-originated packets and strips them prior to final delivery to their destination. The IP addresses in this "outer header" are RLOCs. During end-to-end packet exchange between two Internet hosts, an ITR prepends a new LISP header to each packet, and an ETR strips the new header. The ITR performs EID-to-RLOC lookups to determine the routing path to the ETR, which has the RLOC as one of its IP addresses.

Some basic rules governing LISP are:

* End-systems only send to addresses that are EIDs. EIDs are typically IP addresses assigned to hosts (other types of EID are supported by LISP, see [RFC8060] for further information). End-systems don’t know that addresses are EIDs versus RLOCs but assume that packets get to their intended destinations. In a system where LISP is deployed, LISP routers intercept EID-addressed packets and assist in delivering them across the network core where EIDs cannot be routed. The procedure a host uses to send IP packets does not change.

* LISP routers mostly deal with Routing Locator addresses. See details in Section 4.2 to clarify what is meant by "mostly".

* RLOCs are always IP addresses assigned to routers, preferably topologically oriented addresses from provider CIDR (Classless Inter-Domain Routing) blocks.

* When a router originates packets, it MAY use as a source address either an EID or RLOC. When acting as a host (e.g., when terminating a transport session such as Secure SHell (SSH),
TELNET, or the Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)), it MAY use an EID that is explicitly assigned for that purpose. An EID that identifies the router as a host MUST NOT be used as an RLOC; an EID is only routable within the scope of a site. A typical BGP configuration might demonstrate this "hybrid" EID/RLOC usage where a router could use its "host-like" EID to terminate iBGP sessions to other routers in a site while at the same time using RLOCs to terminate eBGP sessions to routers outside the site.

* Packets with EIDs in them are not expected to be delivered end-to-end in the absence of an EID-to-RLOC mapping operation. They are expected to be used locally for intra-site communication or to be encapsulated for inter-site communication.

* EIDs MAY also be structured (subnetted) in a manner suitable for local routing within an Autonomous System (AS).

An additional LISP header MAY be prepended to packets by a TE-ITR when re-routing of the path for a packet is desired. A potential use-case for this would be an ISP router that needs to perform Traffic Engineering for packets flowing through its network. In such a situation, termed "Recursive Tunneling", an ISP transit acts as an additional ITR, and the destination RLOC it uses for the new prepended header would be either a TE-ETR within the ISP (along an intra-ISP traffic engineered path) or a TE-ETR within another ISP (an inter-ISP traffic engineered path, where an agreement to build such a path exists).

In order to avoid excessive packet overhead as well as possible encapsulation loops, this document RECOMMENDS that a maximum of two LISP headers can be prepended to a packet. For initial LISP deployments, it is assumed that two headers is sufficient, where the first prepended header is used at a site for Location/Identity separation and the second prepended header is used inside a service provider for Traffic Engineering purposes.

Tunnel Routers can be placed fairly flexibly in a multi-AS topology. For example, the ITR for a particular end-to-end packet exchange might be the first-hop or default router within a site for the source host. Similarly, the ETR might be the last-hop router directly connected to the destination host. Another example, perhaps for a VPN service outsourced to an ISP by a site, the ITR could be the site’s border router at the service provider attachment point. Mixing and matching of site-operated, ISP-operated, and other Tunnel Routers is allowed for maximum flexibility.
4.1. Deployment on the Public Internet

Several of the mechanisms in this document are intended for deployment in controlled, trusted environments, and are insecure for use over the public Internet. In particular, on the public internet xTRs:

* MUST set the N, L, E, and V bits in the LISP header (Section 5.1) to zero.

* MUST NOT use Locator-Status-Bits and echo-nonce, as described in Section 10 for Routing Locator Reachability. Instead MUST rely solely on control-plane methods.

* MUST NOT use Gleaning or Locator-Status-Bits and Map-Versioning, as described in Section 13 to update the EID-to-RLOC Mappings. Instead relying solely on control-plane methods.

4.2. Packet Flow Sequence

This section provides an example of the unicast packet flow, including also Control-Plane information as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis]. The example also assumes the following conditions:

* Source host "host1.abc.example.com" is sending a packet to "host2.xyz.example.com", exactly as it would if the site was not not using LISP.

* Each site is multihomed, so each Tunnel Router has an address (RLOC) assigned from the service provider address block for each provider to which that particular Tunnel Router is attached.

* The ITR(s) and ETR(s) are directly connected to the source and destination, respectively, but the source and destination can be located anywhere in the LISP site.

* A Map-Request is sent for an external destination when the destination is not found in the forwarding table or matches a default route. Map-Requests are sent to the mapping database system by using the LISP Control-Plane protocol documented in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

* Map-Replies are sent on the underlying routing system topology using the [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] Control-Plane protocol.

Client host1.abc.example.com wants to communicate with server host2.xyz.example.com:
1. host1.abc.example.com wants to open a TCP connection to
   host2.xyz.example.com. It does a DNS lookup on
   host2.xyz.example.com. An A/AAAA record is returned. This
   address is the destination EID. The locally assigned address of
   host1.abc.example.com is used as the source EID. An IPv4 or IPv6
   packet is built and forwarded through the LISP site as a normal
   IP packet until it reaches a LISP ITR.

2. The LISP ITR must be able to map the destination EID to an RLOC
   of one of the ETRs at the destination site. A method to do this
   is to send a LISP Map-Request, as specified in
   [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

3. The mapping system helps forwarding the Map-Request to the
   corresponding ETR. When the Map-Request arrives at one of the
   ETRs at the destination site, it will process the packet as a
   control message.

4. The ETR looks at the destination EID of the Map-Request and
   matches it against the prefixes in the ETR’s configured EID-to-
   RLOC mapping database. This is the list of EID-Prefixes the ETR
   is supporting for the site it resides in. If there is no match,
   the Map-Request is dropped. Otherwise, a LISP Map-Reply is
   returned to the ITR.

5. The ITR receives the Map-Reply message, parses the message, and
   stores the mapping information from the packet. This information
   is stored in the ITR’s EID-to-RLOC Map-Cache. Note that the Map-
   Cache is an on-demand cache. An ITR will manage its Map-Cache in
   such a way that optimizes for its resource constraints.

6. Subsequent packets from host1.abc.example.com to
   host2.xyz.example.com will have a LISP header prepended by the
   ITR using the appropriate RLOC as the LISP header destination
   address learned from the ETR. Note that the packet MAY be sent
   to a different ETR than the one that returned the Map-Reply due
   to the source site’s hashing policy or the destination site’s
   Locator-Set policy.

7. The ETR receives these packets directly (since the destination
   address is one of its assigned IP addresses), checks the validity
   of the addresses, strips the LISP header, and forwards packets to
   the attached destination host.

8. In order to defer the need for a mapping lookup in the reverse
   direction, an ETR can OPTIONALLY create a cache entry that maps
   the source EID (inner-header source IP address) to the source
   RLOC (outer-header source IP address) in a received LISP packet.
Such a cache entry is termed a "glean mapping" and only contains a single RLOC for the EID in question. More complete information about additional RLOCs SHOULD be verified by sending a LISP Map-Request for that EID. Both the ITR and the ETR MAY also influence the decision the other makes in selecting an RLOC.

5. LISP Encapsulation Details

Since additional tunnel headers are prepended, the packet becomes larger and can exceed the MTU of any link traversed from the ITR to the ETR. It is RECOMMENDED in IPv4 that packets do not get fragmented as they are encapsulated by the ITR. Instead, the packet is dropped and an ICMP Unreachable/Fragmentation-Needed message is returned to the source.

In the case when fragmentation is needed, this specification RECOMMENDS that implementations provide support for one of the proposed fragmentation and reassembly schemes. Two existing schemes are detailed in Section 7.

Since IPv4 or IPv6 addresses can be either EIDs or RLOCs, the LISP architecture supports IPv4 EIDs with IPv6 RLOCs (where the inner header is in IPv4 packet format and the outer header is in IPv6 packet format) or IPv6 EIDs with IPv4 RLOCs (where the inner header is in IPv6 packet format and the outer header is in IPv4 packet format). The next sub-sections illustrate packet formats for the homogeneous case (IPv4-in-IPv4 and IPv6-in-IPv6), but all 4 combinations MUST be supported. Additional types of EIDs are defined in [RFC8060].

As LISP uses UDP encapsulation to carry traffic between xTRs across the Internet, implementors should be aware of the provisions of [RFC8085], especially those given in section 3.1.11 on congestion control for UDP tunneling.

Implementors are encouraged to consider UDP checksum usage guidelines in section 3.4 of [RFC8085] when it is desirable to protect UDP and LISP headers against corruption.

5.1. LISP IPv4-in-IPv4 Header Format
5.2. LISP IPv6-in-IPv6 Header Format

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Version | IHL  | DSCP   | ECN|          Total Length         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Identification |Flags|      Fragment Offset    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Time to Live | Protocol = 17 |     Header Checksum     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                    Source Routing Locator                     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                 Destination Routing Locator                   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Source Port = xxxx | Dest Port = 4341 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| UDP Length | UDP Checksum |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
L |N|LE|V|I|R|K|K|            Nonce/Map-Version                  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     Instance ID/Locator-Status-Bits               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
IH |  Time to Live |    Protocol   |         Header Checksum       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           Source EID                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                         Destination EID                       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

IHL = IP-Header-Length
```
5.3. Tunnel Header Field Descriptions

Inner Header (IH): The inner header is the header on the datagram received from the originating host [RFC0791] [RFC8200] [RFC2474]. The source and destination IP addresses are EIDs.

Outer Header: (OH) The outer header is a new header prepended by an
ITR. The address fields contain RLOCs obtained from the ingress router’s EID-to-RLOC Cache. The IP protocol number is "UDP (17)" from [RFC0768]. The setting of the Don’t Fragment (DF) bit ‘Flags’ field is according to rules listed in Sections 7.1 and 7.2.

UDP Header: The UDP header contains an ITR selected source port when encapsulating a packet. See Section 12 for details on the hash algorithm used to select a source port based on the 5-tuple of the inner header. The destination port MUST be set to the well-known IANA-assigned port value 4341.

UDP Checksum: The ‘UDP Checksum’ field SHOULD be transmitted as zero by an ITR for either IPv4 [RFC0768] and IPv6 encapsulation [RFC6935] [RFC6936]. When a packet with a zero UDP checksum is received by an ETR, the ETR MUST accept the packet for decapsulation. When an ITR transmits a non-zero value for the UDP checksum, it MUST send a correctly computed value in this field. When an ETR receives a packet with a non-zero UDP checksum, it MAY choose to verify the checksum value. If it chooses to perform such verification, and the verification fails, the packet MUST be silently dropped. If the ETR chooses not to perform the verification, or performs the verification successfully, the packet MUST be accepted for decapsulation. The handling of UDP zero checksums over IPv6 for all tunneling protocols, including LISP, is subject to the applicability statement in [RFC6936].

UDP Length: The ‘UDP Length’ field is set for an IPv4-encapsulated packet to be the sum of the inner-header IPv4 Total Length plus the UDP and LISP header lengths. For an IPv6-encapsulated packet, the ‘UDP Length’ field is the sum of the inner-header IPv6 Payload Length, the size of the IPv6 header (40 octets), and the size of the UDP and LISP headers.

N: The N-bit is the nonce-present bit. When this bit is set to 1, the low-order 24 bits of the first 32 bits of the LISP header contain a Nonce. See Section 10.1 for details. Both N- and V-bits MUST NOT be set in the same packet. If they are, a decapsulating ETR MUST treat the ‘Nonce/Map-Version’ field as having a Nonce value present.

L: The L-bit is the ‘Locator-Status-Bits’ field enabled bit. When this bit is set to 1, the Locator-Status-Bits in the second 32 bits of the LISP header are in use.
E: The E-bit is the echo-nonce-request bit. This bit MUST be
 ignored and has no meaning when the N-bit is set to 0. When the
 N-bit is set to 1 and this bit is set to 1, an ITR is requesting
 that the nonce value in the 'Nonce' field be echoed back in LISP-
 encapsulated packets when the ITR is also an ETR. See
 Section 10.1 for details.

V: The V-bit is the Map-Version present bit. When this bit is set
to 1, the N-bit MUST be 0. Refer to the [I-D.ietf-lisp-6834bis]
specification for more details on Database Map-Versioning. This
bit indicates that the LISP header is encoded in this case as:

I: The I-bit is the Instance ID bit. See Section 8 for more
details. When this bit is set to 1, the 'Locator-Status-Bits'
field is reduced to 8 bits and the high-order 24 bits are used as
an Instance ID. If the L-bit is set to 0, then the low-order
8 bits are transmitted as zero and ignored on receipt. The format
of the LISP header would look like this:

R: The R-bit is a Reserved and unassigned bit for future use. It
MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

KK: The KK-bits are a 2-bit field used when encapsulated packets are
encrypted. The field is set to 00 when the packet is not
encrypted. See [RFC8061] for further information.

LISP Nonce: The LISP 'Nonce' field is a 24-bit value that is
randomly generated by an ITR when the N-bit is set to 1. Nonce
generation algorithms are an implementation matter but are
required to generate different nonces when sending to different
RLOCs. The nonce is also used when the E-bit is set to request
the nonce value to be echoed by the other side when packets are
returned. When the E-bit is clear but the N-bit is set, a remote
ITR is either echoing a previously requested echo-nonce or
providing a random nonce. See Section 10.1 for more details.
Finally, when both the N and V-bit are not set (N=0, V=0), then
both the Nonce and Map-Version fields are set to 0 and ignored on
receipt.

LISP Locator-Status-Bits (LSBs): When the L-bit is also set, the
'Locator-Status-Bits' field in the LISP header is set by an ITR to
indicate to an ETR the up/down status of the Locators in the
source site. Each RLOC in a Map-Reply is assigned an ordinal
value from 0 to n-1 (when there are n RLOCs in a mapping entry).
The Locator-Status-Bits are numbered from 0 to n-1 from the least
significant bit of the field. The field is 32 bits when the I-bit
is set to 0 and is 8 bits when the I-bit is set to 1. When a
Locator-Status-Bit is set to 1, the ITR is indicating to the ETR
that the RLOC associated with the bit ordinal has up status. See
Section 10 for details on how an ITR can determine the status of
the ETRs at the same site. When a site has multiple EID-Prefixes
that result in multiple mappings (where each could have a
different Locator-Set), the Locator-Status-Bits setting in an
encapsulated packet MUST reflect the mapping for the EID-Prefix
that the inner-header source EID address matches (longest-match).
If the LSB for an anycast Locator is set to 1, then there is at
least one RLOC with that address, and the ETR is considered 'up'.

When doing ITR/PITR encapsulation:

* The outer-header 'Time to Live' field (or 'Hop Limit' field, in
  the case of IPv6) SHOULD be copied from the inner-header 'Time to
  Live' field.

* The outer-header IPv4 'Differentiated Services Code Point' (DSCP)
  field or the 'Traffic Class' field, in the case of IPv6, SHOULD be
  copied from the inner-header IPv4 DSCP field or 'Traffic Class'
  field in the case of IPv6, to the outer-header. Guidelines for
  this can be found at [RFC2983].

* The IPv4 'Explicit Congestion Notification' (ECN) field and bits 6
  and 7 of the IPv6 'Traffic Class' field requires special treatment
  in order to avoid discarding indications of congestion as
  specified in [RFC6040].
When doing ETR/PETR decapsulation:

* The inner-header IPv4 'Time to Live' field or 'Hop Limit' field in the case of IPv6, MUST be copied from the outer-header 'Time to Live'/‘Hop Limit’ field, when the 'Time to Live'/‘Hop Limit’ value of the outer header is less than the 'Time to Live'/‘Hop Limit’ value of the inner header. Failing to perform this check can cause the 'Time to Live'/‘Hop Limit’ of the inner header to increment across encapsulation/decapsulation cycles. This check is also performed when doing initial encapsulation, when a packet comes to an ITR or PITR destined for a LISP site.

* The outer-header IPv4 'Differentiated Services Code Point' (DSCP) field or the 'Traffic Class' field in the case of IPv6, SHOULD be copied from the outer-header IPv4 DSCP field or 'Traffic Class' field in the case of IPv6, to the inner-header. Guidelines for this can be found at [RFC2983].

* The IPv4 'Explicit Congestion Notification' (ECN) field and bits 6 and 7 of the IPv6 'Traffic Class' field, requires special treatment in order to avoid discarding indications of congestion as specified in [RFC6040]. Note that implementations exist that copy the 'ECN' field from the outer header to the inner header even though [RFC6040] does not recommend this behavior. It is RECOMMENDED that implementations change to support the behavior in [RFC6040].

Note that if an ETR/PETR is also an ITR/PITR and chooses to re-encapsulate after decapsulating, the net effect of this is that the new outer header will carry the same Time to Live as the old outer header minus 1.

Copying the Time to Live (TTL) serves two purposes: first, it preserves the distance the host intended the packet to travel; second, and more importantly, it provides for suppression of looping packets in the event there is a loop of concatenated tunnels due to misconfiguration.

Some xTRs and PxTRs performs re-encapsulation operations and need to treat the 'Explicit Congestion Notification' (ECN) in a special way. Because the re-encapsulation operation is a sequence of two operations, namely a decapsulation followed by an encapsulation, the ECN bits MUST be treated as described above for these two operations.

The LISP dataplane protocol is not backwards compatible with [RFC6830] and does not have explicit support for introducing future protocol changes (e.g. an explicit version field). However, the LISP control plane [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] allows an ETR to register...
dataplane capabilities by means of new LCAF types [RFC8060]. In this way an ITR can be made aware of the dataplane capabilities of an ETR, and encapsulate accordingly. The specification of the new LCAF types, new LCAF mechanisms, and their use, is out of the scope of this document.

6. LISP EID-to-RLOC Map-Cache

ITRs and PITRs maintain an on-demand cache, referred as LISP EID-to-RLOC Map-Cache, that contains mappings from EID-prefixes to locator sets. The cache is used to encapsulate packets from the EID space to the corresponding RLOC network attachment point.

When an ITR/PITR receives a packet from inside of the LISP site to destinations outside of the site a longest-prefix match lookup of the EID is done to the Map-Cache.

When the lookup succeeds, the Locator-Set retrieved from the Map-Cache is used to send the packet to the EID’s topological location.

If the lookup fails, the ITR/PITR needs to retrieve the mapping using the LISP Control-Plane protocol [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis]. While the mapping is being retrieved, the ITR/PITR can either drop or buffer the packets. This document does not have specific recommendations about the action to be taken. It is up to the deployer to consider whether or not it is desirable to buffer packets and deploy a LISP implementation that offers the desired behaviour. Once the mapping is resolved it is then stored in the local Map-Cache to forward subsequent packets addressed to the same EID-prefix.

The Map-Cache is a local cache of mappings, entries are expired based on the associated Time to live. In addition, entries can be updated with more current information, see Section 13 for further information on this. Finally, the Map-Cache also contains reachability information about EIDs and RLOCs, and uses LISP reachability information mechanisms to determine the reachability of RLOCs, see Section 10 for the specific mechanisms.

7. Dealing with Large Encapsulated Packets

This section proposes two mechanisms to deal with packets that exceed the path MTU between the ITR and ETR.

It is left to the implementor to decide if the stateless or stateful mechanism SHOULD be implemented. Both or neither can be used, since it is a local decision in the ITR regarding how to deal with MTU issues, and sites can interoperable with differing mechanisms.
Both stateless and stateful mechanisms also apply to Re-encapsulating and Recursive Tunneling, so any actions below referring to an ITR also apply to a TE-ITR.

7.1. A Stateless Solution to MTU Handling

An ITR stateless solution to handle MTU issues is described as follows:

1. Define $H$ to be the size, in octets, of the outer header an ITR prepends to a packet. This includes the UDP and LISP header lengths.

2. Define $L$ to be the size, in octets, of the maximum-sized packet an ITR can send to an ETR without the need for the ITR or any intermediate routers to fragment the packet. The network administrator of the LISP deployment has to determine what is the suitable value of $L$ so to make sure that no MTU issues arise.

3. Define an architectural constant $S$ for the maximum size of a packet, in octets, an ITR MUST receive from the source so the effective MTU can be met. That is, $L = S + H$.

When an ITR receives a packet from a site-facing interface and adds $H$ octets worth of encapsulation to yield a packet size greater than $L$ octets (meaning the received packet size was greater than $S$ octets from the source), it resolves the MTU issue by first splitting the original packet into 2 equal-sized fragments. A LISP header is then prepended to each fragment. The size of the encapsulated fragments is then $(S/2 + H)$, which is less than the ITR’s estimate of the path MTU between the ITR and its correspondent ETR.

When an ETR receives encapsulated fragments, it treats them as two individually encapsulated packets. It strips the LISP headers and then forwards each fragment to the destination host of the destination site. The two fragments are reassembled at the destination host into the single IP datagram that was originated by the source host. Note that reassembly can happen at the ETR if the encapsulated packet was fragmented at or after the ITR.

This behavior MUST be performed by the ITR only when the source host originates a packet with the 'DF' field of the IP header set to 0. When the 'DF' field of the IP header is set to 1, or the packet is an IPv6 packet originated by the source host, the ITR will drop the packet when the size (adding in the size of the encapsulation header) is greater than $L$ and send an ICMPv4 ICMP Unreachable/Fragmentation-Needed or ICMPv6 "Packet Too Big" message to the source with a value of $S$, where $S$ is $(L - H)$. 

When the outer-header encapsulation uses an IPv4 header, an implementation SHOULD set the DF bit to 1 so ETR fragment reassembly can be avoided. An implementation MAY set the DF bit in such headers to 0 if it has good reason to believe there are unresolvable path MTU issues between the sending ITR and the receiving ETR.

This specification RECOMMENDS that L be defined as 1500. Additional information about in-network MTU and fragmentation issues can be found at [RFC4459].

7.2. A Stateful Solution to MTU Handling

An ITR stateful solution to handle MTU issues is described as follows:

1. The ITR will keep state of the effective MTU for each Locator per Map-Cache entry. The effective MTU is what the core network can deliver along the path between the ITR and ETR.

2. When an IPv4-encapsulated packet with the DF bit set to 1, exceeds what the core network can deliver, one of the intermediate routers on the path will send an an ICMPv4 Unreachable/Fragmentation-Needed to the ITR, respectively. The ITR will parse the ICMP message to determine which Locator is affected by the effective MTU change and then record the new effective MTU value in the Map-Cache entry.

3. When a packet is received by the ITR from a source inside of the site and the size of the packet is greater than the effective MTU stored with the Map-Cache entry associated with the destination EID the packet is for, the ITR will send an ICMPv4 ICMP Unreachable/Fragmentation-Needed message back to the source. The packet size advertised by the ITR in the ICMP message is the effective MTU minus the LISP encapsulation length.

Even though this mechanism is stateful, it has advantages over the stateless IP fragmentation mechanism, by not involving the destination host with reassembly of ITR fragmented packets.

Please note that [RFC1191] and [RFC1981], which describe the use of ICMP packets for PMTU discovery, can behave suboptimally in the presence of ICMP black holes or off-path attackers that spoof ICMP. Possible mitigations include ITRs and ETRs cooperating on MTU probe packets ([RFC4821], [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-datagram-plpmtud]), or ITRs storing the beginning of large packets to verify that they match the echoed packet in ICMP Frag Needed/PTB.
8. Using Virtualization and Segmentation with LISP

There are several cases where segregation is needed at the EID level. For instance, this is the case for deployments containing overlapping addresses, traffic isolation policies or multi-tenant virtualization. For these and other scenarios where segregation is needed, Instance IDs are used.

An Instance ID can be carried in a LISP-encapsulated packet. An ITR that prepends a LISP header will copy a 24-bit value used by the LISP router to uniquely identify the address space. The value is copied to the 'Instance ID' field of the LISP header, and the I-bit is set to 1.

When an ETR decapsulates a packet, the Instance ID from the LISP header is used as a table identifier to locate the forwarding table to use for the inner destination EID lookup.

For example, an 802.1Q VLAN tag or VPN identifier could be used as a 24-bit Instance ID. See [I-D.ietf-lisp-vpn] for LISP VPN use-case details. Please note that the Instance ID is not protected, an on-path attacker can modify the tags and for instance, allow communications between logically isolated VLANs.

Participants within a LISP deployment must agree on the meaning of Instance ID values. The source and destination EIDs MUST belong to the same Instance ID.

Instance ID SHOULD NOT be used with overlapping IPv6 EID addresses.

9. Routing Locator Selection

The Map-Cache contains the state used by ITRs and PITRs to encapsulate packets. When an ITR/PITR receives a packet from inside the LISP site to a destination outside of the site a longest-prefix match lookup of the EID is done to the Map-Cache (see Section 6). The lookup returns a single Locator-Set containing a list of RLOCs corresponding to the EID’s topological location. Each RLOC in the Locator-Set is associated with a 'Priority' and 'Weight', this information is used to select the RLOC to encapsulate.

The RLOC with the lowest 'Priority' is selected. An RLOC with 'Priority' 255 means that MUST NOT be used for forwarding. When multiple RLOCs have the same 'Priority' then the 'Weight' states how to load balance traffic among them. The value of the 'Weight' represents the relative weight of the total packets that match the mapping entry.
The following are different scenarios for choosing RLOCs and the controls that are available:

* The server-side returns one RLOC. The client-side can only use one RLOC. The server-side has complete control of the selection.

* The server-side returns a list of RLOCs where a subset of the list has the same best Priority. The client can only use the subset list according to the weighting assigned by the server-side. In this case, the server-side controls both the subset list and load-splitting across its members. The client-side can use RLOCs outside of the subset list if it determines that the subset list is unreachable (unless RLOCs are set to a Priority of 255). Some sharing of control exists: the server-side determines the destination RLOC list and load distribution while the client-side has the option of using alternatives to this list if RLOCs in the list are unreachable.

* The server-side sets a Weight of zero for the RLOC subset list. In this case, the client-side can choose how the traffic load is spread across the subset list. See Section 12 for details on load-sharing mechanisms. Control is shared by the server-side determining the list and the client-side determining load distribution. Again, the client can use alternative RLOCs if the server-provided list of RLOCs is unreachable.

* Either side (more likely the server-side ETR) decides to "glean" the RLOCs. For example, if the server-side ETR gleanes RLOCs, then the client-side ITR gives the client-side ITR responsibility for bidirectional RLOC reachability and preferability. Server-side ETR gleaning of the client-side ITR RLOC is done by caching the inner-header source EID and the outer-header source RLOC of received packets. The client-side ITR controls how traffic is returned and can alternate using an outer-header source RLOC, which then can be added to the list the server-side ETR uses to return traffic. Since no Priority or Weights are provided using this method, the server-side ETR MUST assume that each client-side ITR RLOC uses the same best Priority with a Weight of zero. In addition, since EID-Prefix encoding cannot be conveyed in data packets, the EID-to-RLOC Cache on Tunnel Routers can grow to be very large. Gleaning has several important considerations. A "gleaned" Map-Cache entry is only stored and used for a RECOMMENDED period of 3 seconds, pending verification. Verification MUST be performed by sending a Map-Request to the source EID (the inner-header IP source address) of the received encapsulated packet. A reply to this "verifying Map-Request" is used to fully populate the Map-Cache entry for the "gleaned" EID and is stored and used for the time indicated from the 'TTL' field.
of a received Map-Reply. When a verified Map-Cache entry is stored, data gleaning no longer occurs for subsequent packets that have a source EID that matches the EID-Prefix of the verified entry. This "gleaning" mechanism MUST NOT be used over the public Internet and SHOULD only be used in trusted and closed deployments. Refer to Section 16 for security issues regarding this mechanism.

RLOCs that appear in EID-to-RLOC Map-Reply messages are assumed to be reachable when the R-bit [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] for the Locator record is set to 1. When the R-bit is set to 0, an ITR or PITR MUST NOT encapsulate to the RLOC. Neither the information contained in a Map-Reply nor that stored in the mapping database system provides reachability information for RLOCs. Note that reachability is not part of the mapping system and is determined using one or more of the Routing Locator reachability algorithms described in the next section.

10. Routing Locator Reachability

Several Data-Plane mechanisms for determining RLOC reachability are currently defined. Please note that additional Control-Plane based reachability mechanisms are defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

1. An ETR MAY examine the Locator-Status-Bits in the LISP header of an encapsulated data packet received from an ITR. If the ETR is also acting as an ITR and has traffic to return to the original ITR site, it can use this status information to help select an RLOC.

2. When an ETR receives an encapsulated packet from an ITR, the source RLOC from the outer header of the packet is likely to be reachable. Please note that in some scenarios the RLOC from the outer header can be a spoofable field.

3. An ITR/ETR pair can use the 'Echo-Noncing' Locator reachability algorithms described in this section.

When determining Locator up/down reachability by examining the Locator-Status-Bits from the LISP-encapsulated data packet, an ETR will receive up-to-date status from an encapsulating ITR about reachability for all ETRs at the site. CE-based ITRs at the source site can determine reachability relative to each other using the site IGP as follows:

* Under normal circumstances, each ITR will advertise a default route into the site IGP.
* If an ITR fails or if the upstream link to its PE fails, its default route will either time out or be withdrawn.

Each ITR can thus observe the presence or lack of a default route originated by the others to determine the Locator-Status-Bits it sets for them.

When ITRs at the site are not deployed in CE routers, the IGP can still be used to determine the reachability of Locators, provided they are injected into the IGP. This is typically done when a /32 address is configured on a loopback interface.

RLOCs listed in a Map-Reply are numbered with ordinals 0 to n-1. The Locator-Status-Bits in a LISP-encapsulated packet are numbered from 0 to n-1 starting with the least significant bit. For example, if an RLOC listed in the 3rd position of the Map-Reply goes down (ordinal value 2), then all ITRs at the site will clear the 3rd least significant bit (xxxx x0xx) of the 'Locator-Status-Bits' field for the packets they encapsulate.

When an xTR decides to use 'Locator-Status-Bits' to affect reachability information, it acts as follows: ETRs decapsulating a packet will check for any change in the 'Locator-Status-Bits' field. When a bit goes from 1 to 0, the ETR, if acting also as an ITR, will refrain from encapsulating packets to an RLOC that is indicated as down. It will only resume using that RLOC if the corresponding Locator-Status-Bit returns to a value of 1. Locator-Status-Bits are associated with a Locator-Set per EID-Prefix. Therefore, when a Locator becomes unreachable, the Locator-Status-Bit that corresponds to that Locator’s position in the list returned by the last Map-Reply will be set to zero for that particular EID-Prefix.

Locator-Status-Bits MUST NOT be used over the public Internet and SHOULD only be used in trusted and closed deployments. In addition Locator-Status-Bits SHOULD be coupled with Map-Versioning [I-D.ietf-lisp-6834bis] to prevent race conditions where Locator-Status-Bits are interpreted as referring to different RLOCs than intended. Refer to Section 16 for security issues regarding this mechanism.
If an ITR encapsulates a packet to an ETR and the packet is received and decapsulated by the ETR, it is implied but not confirmed by the ITR that the ETR’s RLOC is reachable. In most cases, the ETR can also reach the ITR but cannot assume this to be true, due to the possibility of path asymmetry. In the presence of unidirectional traffic flow from an ITR to an ETR, the ITR SHOULD NOT use the lack of return traffic as an indication that the ETR is unreachable. Instead, it MUST use an alternate mechanism to determine reachability.

The security considerations of Section 16 related to data-plane reachability applies to the data-plane RLOC reachability mechanisms described in this section.

10.1. Echo Nonce Algorithm

When data flows bidirectionally between Locators from different sites, a Data-Plane mechanism called "nonce echoing" can be used to determine reachability between an ITR and ETR. When an ITR wants to solicit a nonce echo, it sets the N- and E-bits and places a 24-bit nonce [RFC4086] in the LISP header of the next encapsulated data packet.

When this packet is received by the ETR, the encapsulated packet is forwarded as normal. When the ETR is an xTR (co-located as an ITR), it then sends a data packet to the ITR (when it is an xTR co-located as an ETR), it includes the nonce received earlier with the N-bit set and E-bit cleared. The ITR sees this "echoed nonce" and knows that the path to and from the ETR is up.

The ITR will set the E-bit and N-bit for every packet it sends while in the echo-nonce-request state. The time the ITR waits to process the echoed nonce before it determines the path is unreachable is variable and is a choice left for the implementation.

If the ITR is receiving packets from the ETR but does not see the nonce echoed while being in the echo-nonce-request state, then the path to the ETR is unreachable. This decision MAY be overridden by other Locator reachability algorithms. Once the ITR determines that the path to the ETR is down, it can switch to another Locator for that EID-Prefix.

Note that "ITR" and "ETR" are relative terms here. Both devices MUST be implementing both ITR and ETR functionality for the echo nonce mechanism to operate.
The ITR and ETR MAY both go into the echo-nonce-request state at the same time. The number of packets sent or the time during which echo nonce requests are sent is an implementation-specific setting. In this case, an xTR receiving the echo-nonce-request packets will suspend the echo-nonce-request state and setup a 'echo-nonce-request-state' timer. After the 'echo-nonce-request-state' timer expires it will resume the echo-nonce-request state.

This mechanism does not completely solve the forward path reachability problem, as traffic may be unidirectional. That is, the ETR receiving traffic at a site MAY not be the same device as an ITR that transmits traffic from that site, or the site-to-site traffic is unidirectional so there is no ITR returning traffic.

The echo-nonce algorithm is bilateral. That is, if one side sets the E-bit and the other side is not enabled for echo-noncing, then the echoing of the nonce does not occur and the requesting side may erroneously consider the Locator unreachable. An ITR SHOULD set the E-bit in an encapsulated data packet when it knows the ETR is enabled for echo-noncing. This is conveyed by the E-bit in the Map-Reply message.

Many implementations default to not advertising they are echo-nonce capable in Map-Reply messages and so RLOC-probing tends to be used for RLOC reachability.

The echo-nonce mechanism MUST NOT be used over the public Internet and MUST only be used in trusted and closed deployments. Refer to Section 16 for security issues regarding this mechanism.

11. EID Reachability within a LISP Site

A site MAY be multihomed using two or more ETRs. The hosts and infrastructure within a site will be addressed using one or more EID-Prefixes that are mapped to the RLOCs of the relevant ETRs in the mapping system. One possible failure mode is for an ETR to lose reachability to one or more of the EID-Prefixes within its own site. When this occurs when the ETR sends Map-Replies, it can clear the R-bit associated with its own Locator. And when the ETR is also an ITR, it can clear its Locator-Status-Bit in the encapsulation data header.

It is recognized that there are no simple solutions to the site partitioning problem because it is hard to know which part of the EID-Prefix range is partitioned and which Locators can reach any sub-ranges of the EID-Prefixes. Note that this is not a new problem introduced by the LISP architecture. The problem exists today when a multihomed site uses BGP to advertise its reachability upstream.
12. Routing Locator Hashing

When an ETR provides an EID-to-RLOC mapping in a Map-Reply message that is stored in the Map-Cache of a requesting ITR, the Locator-Set for the EID-Prefix MAY contain different Priority and Weight values for each locator address. When more than one best Priority Locator exists, the ITR can decide how to load-share traffic against the corresponding Locators.

The following hash algorithm MAY be used by an ITR to select a Locator for a packet destined to an EID for the EID-to-RLOC mapping:

1. Either a source and destination address hash or the traditional 5-tuple hash can be used. The traditional 5-tuple hash includes the source and destination addresses; source and destination TCP, UDP, or Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) port numbers; and the IP protocol number field or IPv6 next-protocol fields of a packet that a host originates from within a LISP site. When a packet is not a TCP, UDP, or SCTP packet, the source and destination addresses only from the header are used to compute the hash.

2. Take the hash value and divide it by the number of Locators stored in the Locator-Set for the EID-to-RLOC mapping.

3. The remainder will yield a value of 0 to "number of Locators minus 1". Use the remainder to select the Locator in the Locator-Set.

The specific hash algorithm the ITR uses for load-sharing is out of scope for this document and does not prevent interoperability.

The Source port SHOULD be the same for all packets belonging to the same flow. Also note that when a packet is LISP encapsulated, the source port number in the outer UDP header needs to be set. Selecting a hashed value allows core routers that are attached to Link Aggregation Groups (LAGs) to load-split the encapsulated packets across member links of such LAGs. Otherwise, core routers would see a single flow, since packets have a source address of the ITR, for packets that are originated by different EIDs at the source site. A suggested setting for the source port number computed by an ITR is a 5-tuple hash function on the inner header, as described above. The source port SHOULD be the same for all packets belonging to the same flow.

Many core router implementations use a 5-tuple hash to decide how to balance packet load across members of a LAG. The 5-tuple hash includes the source and destination addresses of the packet and the
source and destination ports when the protocol number in the packet is TCP or UDP. For this reason, UDP encoding is used for LISP encapsulation. In this scenario, when the outer header is IPv6, the flow label MAY also be set following the procedures specified in [RFC6438]. When the inner header is IPv6 then the flow label is not zero, it MAY be used to compute the hash.

13. Changing the Contents of EID-to-RLOC Mappings

Since the LISP architecture uses a caching scheme to retrieve and store EID-to-RLOC mappings, the only way an ITR can get a more up-to-date mapping is to re-request the mapping. However, the ITRs do not know when the mappings change, and the ETRs do not keep track of which ITRs requested its mappings. For scalability reasons, it is desirable to maintain this approach but need to provide a way for ETRs to change their mappings and inform the sites that are currently communicating with the ETR site using such mappings.

This section defines two Data-Plane mechanism for updating EID-to-RLOC mappings. Additionally, the Solicit-Map Request (SMR) Control-Plane updating mechanism is specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

13.1. Locator-Status-Bits

Locator-Status-Bits (LSB) can also be used to keep track of the Locator status (up or down) when EID-to-RLOC mappings are changing. When LSB are used in a LISP deployment, all LISP tunnel routers MUST implement both ITR and ETR capabilities (therefore all tunnel routers are effectively xTRs). In this section the term "source xTR" is used to refer to the xTR setting the LSB and "destination xTR" is used to refer to the xTR receiving the LSB. The procedure is as follows:

First, when a Locator record is added or removed from the Locator-Set, the source xTR will signal this by sending a Solicit-Map Request (SMR) Control-Plane message [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] to the destination xTR. At this point the source xTR MUST NOT use LSB (L-bit = 0) since the destination xTR site has outdated information. The source xTR will setup a 'use-LSB' timer.

Second and as defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis], upon reception of the SMR message the destination xTR will retrieve the updated EID-to-RLOC mappings by sending a Map-Request.
And third, when the 'use-LSB' timer expires, the source xTR can use again LSB with the destination xTR to signal the Locator status (up or down). The specific value for the 'use-LSB' timer depends on the LISP deployment, the 'use-LSB' timer needs to be large enough for the destination xTR to retrieve the updated EID-to-RLOC mappings. A RECOMMENDED value for the 'use-LSB' timer is 5 minutes.

13.2. Database Map-Versioning

When there is unidirectional packet flow between an ITR and ETR, and the EID-to-RLOC mappings change on the ETR, it needs to inform the ITR so encapsulation to a removed Locator can stop and can instead be started to a new Locator in the Locator-Set.

An ETR, can send Map-Reply messages carrying a Map-Version Number in an EID-record. This is known as the Destination Map-Version Number. ITRs include the Destination Map-Version Number in packets they encapsulate to the site.

An ITR, when it encapsulates packets to ETRs, can convey its own Map-Version Number. This is known as the Source Map-Version Number.

When presented in EID-records of Map-Register messages, a Map-Version Number is a good way for the Map-Server to assure that all ETRs for a site registering to it are synchronized according to Map-Version Number.

See [I-D.ietf-lisp-6834bis] for a more detailed analysis and description of Database Map-Versioning.

14. Multicast Considerations

A multicast group address, as defined in the original Internet architecture, is an identifier of a grouping of topologically independent receiver host locations. The address encoding itself does not determine the location of the receiver(s). The multicast routing protocol, and the network-based state the protocol creates, determine where the receivers are located.
In the context of LISP, a multicast group address is both an EID and a Routing Locator. Therefore, no specific semantic or action needs to be taken for a destination address, as it would appear in an IP header. Therefore, a group address that appears in an inner IP header built by a source host will be used as the destination EID. The outer IP header (the destination Routing Locator address), prepended by a LISP router, can use the same group address as the destination Routing Locator, use a multicast or unicast Routing Locator obtained from a Mapping System lookup, or use other means to determine the group address mapping.

With respect to the source Routing Locator address, the ITR prepends its own IP address as the source address of the outer IP header, just like it would if the destination EID was a unicast address. This source Routing Locator address, like any other Routing Locator address, MUST be routable on the underlay.

There are two approaches for LISP-Multicast, one that uses native multicast routing in the underlay with no support from the Mapping System and the other that uses only unicast routing in the underlay with support from the Mapping System. See [RFC6831] and [RFC8378], respectively, for details. Details for LISP-Multicast and interworking with non-LISP sites are described in [RFC6831] and [RFC6832].

15. Router Performance Considerations

LISP is designed to be very "hardware-based forwarding friendly". A few implementation techniques can be used to incrementally implement LISP:

* When a tunnel-encapsulated packet is received by an ETR, the outer destination address may not be the address of the router. This makes it challenging for the control plane to get packets from the hardware. This may be mitigated by creating special Forwarding Information Base (FIB) entries for the EID-Prefixes of EIDs served by the ETR (those for which the router provides an RLOC translation). These FIB entries are marked with a flag indicating that Control-Plane processing SHOULD be performed. The forwarding logic of testing for particular IP protocol number values is not necessary. There are a few proven cases where no changes to existing deployed hardware were needed to support the LISP Data-Plane.
* On an ITR, prepending a new IP header consists of adding more octets to a MAC rewrite string and prepending the string as part of the outgoing encapsulation procedure. Routers that support Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE) tunneling [RFC2784] or 6to4 tunneling [RFC3056] may already support this action.

* A packet’s source address or interface the packet was received on can be used to select VRF (Virtual Routing/Forwarding). The VRF’s routing table can be used to find EID-to-RLOC mappings.

For performance issues related to Map-Cache management, see Section 16.

16. Security Considerations

In what follows we highlight security considerations that apply when LISP is deployed in environments such as those specified in Section 1.1.

The optional mechanisms of gleaning is offered to directly obtain a mapping from the LISP encapsulated packets. Specifically, an xTR can learn the EID-to-RLOC mapping by inspecting the source RLOC and source EID of an encapsulated packet, and insert this new mapping into its Map-Cache. An off-path attacker can spoof the source EID address to divert the traffic sent to the victim’s spoofed EID. If the attacker spoofs the source RLOC, it can mount a DoS attack by redirecting traffic to the spoofed victim’s RLOC, potentially overloading it.

The LISP Data-Plane defines several mechanisms to monitor RLOC Data-Plane reachability, in this context Locator-Status Bits, Nonce-Present and Echo-Nonce bits of the LISP encapsulation header can be manipulated by an attacker to mount a DoS attack. An off-path attacker able to spoof the RLOC and/or nonce of a victim’s xTR can manipulate such mechanisms to declare false information about the RLOC’s reachability status.

For example of such attacks, an off-path attacker can exploit the echo-nonce mechanism by sending data packets to an ITR with a random nonce from an ETR’s spoofed RLOC. Note the attacker must guess a valid nonce the ITR is requesting to be echoed within a small window of time. The goal is to convince the ITR that the ETR’s RLOC is reachable even when it may not be reachable. If the attack is successful, the ITR believes the wrong reachability status of the ETR’s RLOC until RLOC-probing detects the correct status. This time frame is on the order of 10s of seconds. This specific attack can be mitigated by preventing RLOC spoofing in the network by deploying uRPF BCP 38 [RFC2827]. In addition and in order to exploit this
vulnerability, the off-path attacker must send echo-nonce packets at high rate. If the nonces have never been requested by the ITR, it can protect itself from erroneous reachability attacks.

A LISP-specific uRPF check is also possible. When decapsulating, an ETR can check that the source EID and RLOC are valid EID-to-RLOC mappings by checking the Mapping System.

Map-Versioning is a Data-Plane mechanism used to signal a peering xTR that a local EID-to-RLOC mapping has been updated, so that the peering xTR uses LISP Control-Plane signaling message to retrieve a fresh mapping. This can be used by an attacker to forge the map-versioning field of a LISP encapsulated header and force an excessive amount of signaling between xTRs that may overload them. Further security considerations on Map-Versioning can be found in [I-D.ietf-lisp-6834bis].

Locator-Status-Bits, echo-nonce and map-versioning MUST NOT be used over the public Internet and SHOULD only be used in trusted and closed deployments. In addition Locator-Status-Bits SHOULD be coupled with map-versioning to prevent race conditions where Locator-Status-Bits are interpreted as referring to different RLOCs than intended.

LISP implementations and deployments which permit outer header fragments of IPv6 LISP encapsulated packets as a means of dealing with MTU issues should also use implementation techniques in ETRs to prevent this from being a DoS attack vector. Limits on the number of fragments awaiting reassembly at an ETR, RTR, or PETR, and the rate of admitting such fragments may be used.

17. Network Management Considerations

Considerations for network management tools exist so the LISP protocol suite can be operationally managed. These mechanisms can be found in [RFC7052] and [RFC6835].

18. Changes since RFC 6830

For implementation considerations, the following changes have been made to this document since RFC 6830 was published:

* It is no longer mandated that a maximum number of 2 LISP headers be prepended to a packet. If there is a application need for more than 2 LISP headers, an implementation can support more. However, it is RECOMMENDED that a maximum of two LISP headers can be prepended to a packet.
* The 3 reserved flag bits in the LISP header have been allocated for [RFC8061]. The low-order 2 bits of the 3-bit field (now named the KK bits) are used as a key identifier. The 1 remaining bit is still documented as reserved and unassigned.

* Data-Plane gleaning for creating map-cache entries has been made optional. Any ITR implementations that depend on or assume the remote ETR is gleaning should not do so. This does not create any interoperability problems since the control-plane map-cache population procedures are unilateral and are the typical method for map-cache population.

* The bulk of the changes to this document which reduces its length are due to moving the LISP control-plane messaging and procedures to [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis].

19. IANA Considerations

This section provides guidance to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) regarding registration of values related to this Data-Plane LISP specification, in accordance with BCP 26 [RFC8126].

19.1. LISP UDP Port Numbers

The IANA registry has allocated UDP port number 4341 for the LISP Data-Plane. IANA has updated the description for UDP port 4341 as follows:

```
lisp-data      4341 udp    LISP Data Packets
```
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Abstract
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1. Introduction

The Locator/ID Separation Protocol [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] (see also [I-D.ietf-lisp-introduction]) specifies an architecture and mechanism for dynamic tunneling by logically separating the addresses currently used by IP in two separate name spaces: Endpoint IDs (EIDs), used within sites; and Routing Locators (RLOCs), used on the
transit networks that make up the Internet infrastructure. To achieve this separation, LISP defines protocol mechanisms for mapping from EIDs to RLOCs. In addition, LISP assumes the existence of a database to store and propagate those mappings across mapping system nodes. Several such databases have been proposed; among them are the Content distribution Overlay Network Service for LISP-NERD (a Not-so-novel EID-to-RLOC Database) [RFC6837], LISP Alternative Logical Topology (LISP-ALT) [RFC6836], and LISP Delegated Database Tree (LISP-DDT) [RFC8111].

The LISP Mapping Service defines two types of LISP-speaking devices: the Map-Resolver, which accepts Map-Requests from an Ingress Tunnel Router (ITR) and "resolves" the EID-to-RLOC mapping using a mapping database; and the Map-Server, which learns authoritative EID-to-RLOC mappings from an Egress Tunnel Router (ETR) and publishes them in a database.

This LISP Control-Plane Mapping Service can be used by many different encapsulation-based or translation-based Data-Planes which include but are not limited to the ones defined in LISP RFC 6830bis [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis], LISP-GPE [I-D.ietf-lisp-gpe], VXLAN [RFC7348], VXLAN-GPE [I-D.ietf-nvo3-vxlan-gpe], GRE [RFC2890], GTP [GTP-3GPP], ILA [I-D.herbert-intarea-ila], and Segment Routing (SRv6) [RFC8402].

Conceptually, LISP Map-Servers share some of the same basic configuration and maintenance properties as Domain Name System (DNS) [RFC1035] servers; likewise, Map-Resolvers are conceptually similar to DNS caching resolvers. With this in mind, this specification borrows familiar terminology (resolver and server) from the DNS specifications.

Note this document doesn’t assume any particular database mapping infrastructure to illustrate certain aspects of Map-Server and Map-Resolver operation. The Mapping Service interface can (and likely will) be used by ITRs and ETRs to access other mapping database systems as the LISP infrastructure evolves.

LISP is not intended to address problems of connectivity and scaling on behalf of arbitrary communicating parties. Relevant situations are described in the scoping section of the introduction to [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis].

This document obsoletes RFC 6830 and 6833.
1.1. Scope of Applicability

LISP was originally developed to address the Internet-wide route scaling problem [RFC4984]. While there are a number of approaches of interest for that problem, as LISP as been developed and refined, a large number of other LISP uses have been found and are being used. As such, the design and development of LISP has changed so as to focus on these use cases. The common property of these uses is a large set of cooperating entities seeking to communicate over the public Internet or other large underlay IP infrastructures, while keeping the addressing and topology of the cooperating entities separate from the underlay and Internet topology, routing, and addressing.

When communicating over the public Internet, deployers MUST consider the following guidelines:

1. LISP-SEC MUST be implemented [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec]. This means that the S-bit MUST be set in the Map-Reply (Section 5.4), Map-Register (Section 5.6) and Encapsulated Control messages (Section 5.8).

2. Implementations SHOULD use the ‘HMAC-SHA256-128+HKDF-SHA256’ as the Algorithm ID (Section 12.5) in Map-Register message (Section 5.6), and MUST NOT use ‘None’ or ‘HMAC-SHA-1-96-None’ as Algorithm ID (Section 12.5) in the Map-Register message (Section 5.6)

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. Definition of Terms

Map-Server: A network infrastructure component that learns of EID-Prefix mapping entries from an ETR, via the registration mechanism described below, or some other authoritative source if one exists. A Map-Server publishes these EID-Prefixes in a mapping database.

Map-Request: A LISP Map-Request is a Control-Plane message to query the mapping system to resolve an EID. A LISP Map-Request can also be sent to an RLOC to test for reachability and to exchange security keys between an encapsulator and a decapsulator. This type of Map-Request is also known as an RLOC-Probe Request.
Map-Reply: A LISP Map-Reply is a Control-Plane message returned in response to a Map-Request sent to the mapping system when resolving an EID. A LISP Map-Reply can also be returned by a decapsulator in response to a Map-Request sent by an encapsulator to test for reachability. This type of Map-Reply is known as a RLOC-Probe Reply.

Encapsulated Map-Request: A LISP Map-Request carried within an Encapsulated Control Message (ECM), which has an additional LISP header prepended. Sent to UDP destination port 4342. The "outer" addresses are routable IP addresses, also known as RLOCs. Used by an ITR when sending to a Map-Resolver and by a Map-Server when forwarding a Map-Request to an ETR.

Map-Resolver: A network infrastructure component that accepts LISP Encapsulated (ECM) Map-Requests, typically from an ITR, and determines whether or not the destination IP address is part of the EID namespace; if it is not, a Negative Map-Reply is returned. Otherwise, the Map-Resolver finds the appropriate EID-to-RLOC mapping by consulting a mapping database system.

Negative Map-Reply: A LISP Map-Reply that contains an empty Locator-Set. Returned in response to a Map-Request if the destination EID is not registered in the mapping system, is policy denied or fails authentication.

Map-Register message: A LISP message sent by an ETR to a Map-Server to register its associated EID-Prefixes. In addition to the set of EID-Prefixes to register, the message includes one or more RLOCs to reach ETR(s). The Map-Server uses these RLOCs when forwarding Map-Requests (re-formatted as Encapsulated Map-Requests). An ETR MAY request that the Map-Server answer Map-Requests on its behalf by setting the "proxy Map-Reply" flag (P-bit) in the message.

Map-Notify message: A LISP message sent by a Map-Server to an ETR to confirm that a Map-Register has been received and processed. An ETR requests that a Map-Notify be returned by setting the "want-map-notify" flag (M-bit) in the Map-Register message. Unlike a Map-Reply, a Map-Notify uses UDP port 4342 for both source and destination. Map-Notify messages are also sent to ITRs by Map-Servers when there are RLOC-set changes.

4. Basic Overview

A Map-Server is a device that publishes EID-Prefixes in a LISP mapping database on behalf of a set of ETRs. When it receives a Map Request (typically originating from an ITR), it consults the mapping database to find an ETR that can answer with the set of RLOCs for an EID-Prefix. To publish its EID-Prefixes, an ETR periodically sends Map-Register messages to the Map-Server. A Map-Register message contains a list of EID-Prefixes plus a set of RLOCs that can be used to reach the ETRs.

When LISP-ALT [RFC6836] is used as the mapping database, a Map-Server connects to the ALT network and acts as a "last-hop" ALT-Router. Intermediate ALT-Routers forward Map-Requests to the Map-Server that advertises a particular EID-Prefix, and the Map-Server forwards them to the owning ETR, which responds with Map-Reply messages.

When LISP-DDT [RFC8111] is used as the mapping database, a Map-Server sends the final Map-Referral messages from the Delegated Database Tree.

A Map-Resolver receives Encapsulated Map-Requests from its client ITRs and uses a mapping database system to find the appropriate ETR to answer those requests. On a LISP-ALT network, a Map-Resolver acts as a "first-hop" ALT-Router. It has Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE) tunnels configured to other ALT-Routers and uses BGP to learn paths to ETRs for different prefixes in the LISP-ALT database. The Map-Resolver uses this path information to forward Map-Requests over the ALT to the correct ETRs. On a LISP-DDT network [RFC8111], a Map-Resolver maintains a referral-cache and acts as a "first-hop" DDT-node. The Map-Resolver uses the referral information to forward Map-Requests.

Note that while it is conceivable that a Map-Resolver could cache responses to improve performance, issues surrounding cache management would need to be resolved so that doing so will be reliable and practical. In this specification, Map-Resolvers will operate only in a non-caching mode, decapsulating and forwarding Encapsulated Map Requests received from ITRs. Any specification of caching functionality is out of scope for this document.

Note that a single device can implement the functions of both a Map-Server and a Map-Resolver, and in many cases the functions will be co-located in that way. Also, there can be ALT-only nodes and DDT-only nodes, when LISP-ALT and LISP-DDT are used, respectively, to connecting Map-Resolvers and Map-Servers together to make up the Mapping System.
5. LISP IPv4 and IPv6 Control-Plane Packet Formats

The following UDP packet formats are used by the LISP control plane.

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Version| IHL |Type of Service|          Total Length         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|         Identification        |Flags|      Fragment Offset    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|  Time to Live | Protocol = 17 |         Header Checksum       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                    Source Routing Locator                     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                 Destination Routing Locator                   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
/ |           Source Port         |         Dest Port             |
UDP +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
\ |           UDP Length          |        UDP Checksum           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                         LISP Message                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
IPv4 UDP LISP Control Message
```
When a UDP Map-Request, Map-Register, or Map-Notify (when used as a notification message) are sent, the UDP source port is chosen by the sender and the destination UDP port number is set to 4342. When a UDP Map-Reply, Map-Notify (when used as an acknowledgement to a Map-Register), or Map-Notify-Ack are sent, the source UDP port number is set to 4342 and the destination UDP port number is copied from the source port of either the Map-Request or the invoking data packet. Implementations MUST be prepared to accept packets when either the source port or destination UDP port is set to 4342 due to NATs changing port number values.

The ‘UDP Length’ field will reflect the length of the UDP header and the LISP Message payload. LISP is expected to be deployed by cooperating entities communicating over underlays. Deployers are
expected to set the MTU according to the specific deployment guidelines to prevent fragmentation of either the inner packet or the outer encapsulated packet. For deployments not aware of the underlay restrictions on path MTU, the message size MUST be limited to 576 bytes for IPv4 or 1280 bytes for IPv6 —considering the entire IP packet— as outlined in [RFC8085].

The UDP checksum is computed and set to non-zero for all messages sent to or from port 4342. It MUST be checked on receipt, and if the checksum fails, the control message MUST be dropped [RFC1071].

The format of control messages includes the UDP header so the checksum and length fields can be used to protect and delimit message boundaries.
5.1. LISP Control Packet Type Allocations

This section defines the LISP control message formats and summarizes for IANA the LISP Type codes assigned by this document. For completeness, the summary below includes the LISP Shared Extension Message assigned by [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc8113bis]. Message type definitions are:

- **Reserved**: 0 b’0000’
- **LISP Map-Request**: 1 b’0001’
- **LISP Map-Reply**: 2 b’0010’
- **LISP Map-Register**: 3 b’0011’
- **LISP Map-Notify**: 4 b’0100’
- **LISP Map-Notify-Ack**: 5 b’0101’
- **LISP Map-Referral**: 6 b’0110’
- **Unassigned**: 7 b’0111’
- **LISP Encapsulated Control Message**: 8 b’1000’
- **Unassigned**: 9-14 b’1001’- b’1110’
- **LISP Shared Extension Message**: 15 b’1111’

Protocol designers experimenting with new message formats are recommended to use the LISP Shared Extension Message Type described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc8113bis].

All LISP Control-Plane messages use Address Family Identifiers (AFI) [AFI] or LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) [RFC8060] formats to encode either fixed or variable length addresses. This includes explicit fields in each control message or part of EID-records or RLOC-records in commonly formatted messages. LISP control-plane messages that include an unrecognized AFI MUST be dropped and the event MUST be logged.

The LISP control-plane describes how other data-planes can encode messages to support the Soliciting of Map-Requests as well as RLOC-probing procedures.
5.2. Map-Request Message Format

```
0                   1                   2                   3
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| Type=1 | A|M|P|S|p|s|R|R|  Rsvd   |L|D|   IRC   | Record Count |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| Nonce . . .                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| . . . Nonce                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| Source-EID-AFI | Source EID Address ... |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| ITR-RLOC-AFI 1 | ITR-RLOC Address 1 ... |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| ...                                               |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
| ITR-RLOC-AFI n | ITR-RLOC Address n ... |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
/ | Reserved                  | EID mask-len | EID-Prefix-AFI |
Rec +---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
\ | EID-Prefix ...                                      |
+---------------------------------------------+---+---+---+---+
\ | Map-Reply Record ...                               |
```

Packet field descriptions:

Type: 1 (Map-Request)

A: This is an authoritative bit, it is set to 1 when an ITR wants the destination site to return the Map-Reply rather than the mapping database system returning a Map-Reply, and set to 0 otherwise.

M: This is the map-data-present bit. When set, it indicates that a Map-Reply Record segment is included in the Map-Request.

P: This is the probe-bit, which indicates that a Map-Request MUST be treated as a Locator reachability probe. The receiver MUST respond with a Map-Reply with the probe-bit set, indicating that the Map-Reply is a Locator reachability probe reply, with the nonce copied from the Map-Request. See RLOC-Probing Section 7.1 for more details. This RLOC-probe Map-Request MUST NOT be sent to the mapping system. If a Map-Resolver or Map-Server receives a Map-Request with the probe-bit set, it MUST drop the message.

S: This is the Solicit-Map-Request (SMR) bit. See Solicit-Map-Request (SMRs) Section 6.1 for details.
p: This is the PITR bit. This bit is set to 1 when a PITR sends a Map-Request. The use of this bit is deployment-specific.

s: This is the SMR-invoked bit. This bit is set to 1 when an xTR is sending a Map-Request in response to a received SMR-based Map-Request.

R: This reserved and unassigned bit MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Rsvd: This field MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

L: This is the local-xtr bit. It is used by an xTR in a LISP site to tell other xTRs in the same site that it is part of the RLOC-set for the LISP site. The L-bit is set to 1 when the RLOC is the sender’s IP address.

D: This is the dont-map-reply bit. It is used in the SMR procedure described in Section 6.1. When an xTR sends an SMR message, it doesn’t need a Map-Reply returned. When this bit is set, the receiver of the Map-Request does not return a Map-Reply.

IRC: This 5-bit field is the ITR-RLOC Count, which encodes the additional number of (‘ITR-RLOC-AFI’, ‘ITR-RLOC Address’) fields present in this message. At least one (ITR-RLOC-AFI, ITR-RLOC-Address) pair MUST be encoded. Multiple ‘ITR-RLOC Address’ fields are used, so a Map-Replier can select which destination address to use for a Map-Reply. The IRC value ranges from 0 to 31. For a value of 0, there is 1 ITR-RLOC address encoded; for a value of 1, there are 2 ITR-RLOC addresses encoded, and so on up to 31, which encodes a total of 32 ITR-RLOC addresses.

Record Count: This is the number of records in this Map-Request message. A record is comprised of the portion of the packet that is labeled ‘Rec’ above and occurs the number of times equal to Record Count. For this version of the protocol, a receiver MUST accept and process Map-Requests that contain one or more records, but a sender MUST only send Map-Requests containing one record.

Nonce: This is an 8-octet random value created by the sender of the Map-Request. This nonce will be returned in the Map-Reply. The nonce is used as an index to identify the corresponding Map-Request when a Map-Reply message is received. The nonce MUST be generated by a properly seeded pseudo-random source, see as an example [RFC4086].
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Source-EID-AFI: This is the address family of the 'Source EID Address' field.

Source EID Address: This is the EID of the source host that originated the packet that caused the Map-Request. When Map-Requests are used for refreshing a Map-Cache entry or for RLOC-Probing, an AFI value 0 is used and this field is of zero length.

ITR-RLOC-AFI: This is the address family of the 'ITR-RLOC Address' field that follows this field.

ITR-RLOC Address: This is used to give the ETR the option of selecting the destination address from any address family for the Map-Reply message. This address MUST be a routable RLOC address of the sender of the Map-Request message.

EID mask-len: This is the mask length for the EID-Prefix.

EID-Prefix-AFI: This is the address family of the EID-Prefix according to [AFI] and [RFC8060].

EID-Prefix: This prefix address length is 4 octets for an IPv4 address family and 16 octets for an IPv6 address family when the EID-Prefix-AFI is 1 or 2, respectively. For other AFIs [AFI], the address length varies and for the LCAF AFI the format is defined in [RFC8060]. When a Map-Request is sent by an ITR because a data packet is received for a destination where there is no mapping entry, the EID-Prefix is set to the destination IP address of the data packet, and the 'EID mask-len' is set to 32 or 128 for IPv4 or IPv6, respectively. When an xTR wants to query a site about the status of a mapping it already has cached, the EID-Prefix used in the Map-Request has the same mask-length as the EID-Prefix returned from the site when it sent a Map-Reply message.

Map-Reply Record: When the M-bit is set, this field is the size of a single "Record" in the Map-Reply format. This Map-Reply record contains the EID-to-RLOC mapping entry associated with the Source EID. This allows the ETR that will receive this Map-Request to cache the data if it chooses to do so. It is important to note that this mapping has not been validated by the Mapping System.

5.3. EID-to-RLOC UDP Map-Request Message

A Map-Request is sent from an ITR when it needs a mapping for an EID, wants to test an RLOC for reachability, or wants to refresh a mapping before TTL expiration. For the initial case, the destination IP address used for the Map-Request is the data packet’s destination address (i.e., the destination EID) that had a mapping cache lookup
failure. For the latter two cases, the destination IP address used for the Map-Request is one of the RLOC addresses from the Locator-Set of the Map-Cache entry. The source address is either an IPv4 or IPv6 RLOC address, depending on whether the Map-Request is using an IPv4 or IPv6 header, respectively. In all cases, the UDP source port number for the Map-Request message is a 16-bit value selected by the ITR/PITR, and the UDP destination port number is set to the well-known destination port number 4342. A successful Map-Reply, which is one that has a nonce that matches an outstanding Map-Request nonce, will update the cached set of RLOCs associated with the EID-Prefix range.

One or more Map-Request ('ITR-RLOC-AFI', 'ITR-RLOC-Address') fields MUST be filled in by the ITR. The number of fields (minus 1) encoded MUST be placed in the ‘IRC’ field. The ITR MAY include all locally configured Locators in this list or just provide one locator address from each address family it supports. If the ITR erroneously provides no ITR-RLOC addresses, the Map-Replier MUST drop the Map-Request.

Map-Requests can also be LISP encapsulated using UDP destination port 4342 with a LISP Type value set to "Encapsulated Control Message", when sent from an ITR to a Map-Resolver. Likewise, Map-Requests are LISP encapsulated the same way from a Map-Server to an ETR. Details on Encapsulated Map-Requests and Map-Resolvers can be found in Section 5.8.

Map-Requests MUST be rate-limited to 1 per second per EID-prefix. After 10 retransmits without receiving the corresponding Map-Reply the sender MUST wait 30 seconds.

An ITR that is configured with mapping database information (i.e., it is also an ETR) MAY optionally include those mappings in a Map-Request. When an ETR configured to accept and verify such "piggybacked" mapping data receives such a Map-Request and it does not have this mapping in the Map-Cache, it MUST originate a "verifying Map-Request" through the mapping database to validate the "piggybacked" mapping data.
5.4. Map-Reply Message Format

Packet field descriptions:

Type: 2 (Map-Reply)

P: This is the probe-bit, which indicates that the Map-Reply is in response to a Locator reachability probe Map-Request. The 'Nonce' field must contain a copy of the nonce value from the original Map-Request. See RLOC-probing Section 7.1 for more details. When the probe-bit is set to 1 in a Map-Reply message, the A-bit in each EID-record included in the message MUST be set to 1, otherwise MUST be silently discarded.

E: This bit indicates that the ETR that sends this Map-Reply message is advertising that the site is enabled for the Echo-Nonce Locator reachability algorithm. See Echo-Nonce [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] for more details.

S: This is the Security bit. When set to 1, the following authentication information will be appended to the end of the Map-Reply. The details can be found in [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec].
Reserved: This unassigned field MUST be set to 0 on transmit and
MUST be ignored on receipt.

Record Count: This is the number of records in this reply message.
A record is comprised of that portion of the packet labeled
‘Record’ above and occurs the number of times equal to Record
Count. Note that the reply count can be larger than the requested
count, for instance when more-specifics are present.

Nonce: This 64-bit value from the Map-Request is echoed in this
‘Nonce’ field of the Map-Reply.

Record TTL: This is the time in minutes the recipient of the Map-
Reply can store the mapping. If the TTL is 0, the entry MUST be
removed from the cache immediately. If the value is 0xffffffff,
the recipient can decide locally how long to store the mapping.

Locator Count: This is the number of Locator entries in the given
Record. A Locator entry comprises what is labeled above as ‘Loc’.
The Locator count can be 0, indicating that there are no Locators
for the EID-Prefix.

EID mask-len: This is the mask length for the EID-Prefix.

ACT: This 3-bit field describes Negative Map-Reply actions. In any
other message type, these bits are set to 0 and ignored on
receipt. These bits are used only when the ‘Locator Count’ field
is set to 0. The action bits are encoded only in Map-Reply
messages. They are used to tell an ITR or PITR why a empty
locator-set was returned from the mapping system and how it stores
the map-cache entry. See Section 12.3 for additional information.

(0) No-Action: The Map-Cache is kept alive, and no packet
encapsulation occurs.

(1) Natively-Forward: The packet is not encapsulated or dropped
but natively forwarded.
(2) Send-Map-Request: The Map-Cache entry is created and flagged that any packet matching this entry invokes sending a Map-Request.

(3) Drop/No-Reason: A packet that matches this Map-Cache entry is dropped. An ICMP Destination Unreachable message SHOULD be sent.

(4) Drop/Policy-Denied: A packet that matches this Map-Cache entry is dropped. The reason for the Drop action is that a Map-Request for the target-EID is being policy denied by either an xTR or the mapping system.

(5) Drop/Authentication-Failure: A packet that matches this Map-Cache entry is dropped. The reason for the Drop action is that a Map-Request for the target-EID fails an authentication verification-check by either an xTR or the mapping system.

A: The Authoritative bit MAY only be set to 1 by an ETR. A Map-Server generating Map-Reply messages as a proxy MUST NOT set the A-bit to 1. This bit indicates to the requesting ITRs if the Map-Reply was originated by a LISP node managed at the site that owns the EID-Prefix.

Map-Version Number: When this 12-bit value in an EID-record of a Map-Reply message is non-zero, follow the procedures in [I-D.ietf-lisp-6834bis] for details.

EID-Prefix-AFI: Address family of the EID-Prefix according to [AFI] and [RFC8060].

EID-Prefix: This prefix is 4 octets for an IPv4 address family and 16 octets for an IPv6 address family.

Priority: Each RLOC is assigned a unicast Priority. Lower values are more preferable. When multiple RLOCs have the same Priority, they may be used in a load-split fashion. A value of 255 means the RLOC MUST NOT be used for unicast forwarding.

Weight: When priorities are the same for multiple RLOCs, the Weight indicates how to balance unicast traffic between them. Weight is encoded as a relative weight of total unicast packets that match the mapping entry. For example, if there are 4 Locators in a Locator-Set, where the Weights assigned are 30, 20, 20, and 10, the first Locator will get 37.5% of the traffic, the 2nd and 3rd Locators will each get 25% of the traffic, and the 4th Locator will get 12.5% of the traffic. If all Weights for a Locator-Set are equal, the receiver of the Map-Reply will decide how to load-
split the traffic. See RLOC-hashing [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] for a suggested hash algorithm to distribute the load across Locators with the same Priority and equal Weight values.

M Priority: Each RLOC is assigned a multicast Priority used by an ETR in a receiver multicast site to select an ITR in a source multicast site for building multicast distribution trees. A value of 255 means the RLOC MUST NOT be used for joining a multicast distribution tree. For more details, see [RFC6831].

M Weight: When priorities are the same for multiple RLOCs, the Weight indicates how to balance building multicast distribution trees across multiple ITRs. The Weight is encoded as a relative weight (similar to the unicast Weights) of the total number of trees built to the source site identified by the EID-Prefix. If all Weights for a Locator-Set are equal, the receiver of the Map-Reply will decide how to distribute multicast state across ITRs. For more details, see [RFC6831].

Unused Flags: These are set to 0 when sending and ignored on receipt.

L: When this bit is set, the Locator is flagged as a local Locator to the ETR that is sending the Map-Reply. When a Map-Server is doing proxy Map-Replying for a LISP site, the L-bit is set to 0 for all Locators in this Locator-Set.

p: When this bit is set, an ETR informs the RLOC-Probing ITR that the locator address for which this bit is set is the one being RLOC-probed and may be different from the source address of the Map-Reply. An ITR that RLOC-probes a particular Locator MUST use this Locator for retrieving the data structure used to store the fact that the Locator is reachable. The p-bit is set for a single Locator in the same Locator-Set. If an implementation sets more than one p-bit erroneously, the receiver of the Map-Reply MUST select the first set p-bit Locator. The p-bit MUST NOT be set for Locator-Set records sent in Map-Request and Map-Register messages.

R: This is set when the sender of a Map-Reply has a route to the Locator in the Locator data record. This receiver may find this useful to know if the Locator is up but not necessarily reachable from the receiver’s point of view.

Locator: This is an IPv4 or IPv6 address (as encoded by the ‘Loc-AFI’ field) assigned to an ETR and used by an ITR as a destination RLOC address in the outer header of a LISP encapsulated packet. Note that the destination RLOC address of a LISP encapsulated packet MAY be an anycast address. A source RLOC of a LISP
encapsulated packet can be an anycast address as well. The source or destination RLOC MUST NOT be the broadcast address (255.255.255.255 or any subnet broadcast address known to the router) and MUST NOT be a link-local multicast address. The source RLOC MUST NOT be a multicast address. The destination RLOC SHOULD be a multicast address if it is being mapped from a multicast destination EID.

Map-Reply MUST be rate-limited, it is RECOMMENDED that a Map-Reply for the same destination RLOC be sent no more than one packets per 3 seconds.

The Record format, as defined here, is used both in the Map-Reply and Map-Register messages, this includes all the field definitions.

5.5. EID-to-RLOC UDP Map-Reply Message

A Map-Reply returns an EID-Prefix with a mask-length that is less than or equal to the EID being requested. The EID being requested is either from the destination field of an IP header of a Data-Probe or the EID of a record of a Map-Request. The RLOCs in the Map-Reply are routable IP addresses of all ETRs for the LISP site. Each RLOC conveys status reachability but does not convey path reachability from a requester's perspective. Separate testing of path reachability is required. See RLOC-reachability Section 7.1 for details.

Note that a Map-Reply MAY contain different EID-Prefix granularity (prefix + mask-length) than the Map-Request that triggers it. This might occur if a Map-Request were for a prefix that had been returned by an earlier Map-Reply. In such a case, the requester updates its cache with the new prefix information and granularity. For example, a requester with two cached EID-Prefixes that are covered by a Map-Reply containing one less-specific prefix replaces the entry with the less-specific EID-Prefix. Note that the reverse, replacement of one less-specific prefix with multiple more-specific prefixes, can also occur, not by removing the less-specific prefix but rather by adding the more-specific prefixes that, during a lookup, will override the less-specific prefix.

When an EID moves out of a LISP site [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility], the database mapping system may have overlapping EID-prefixes. Or when a LISP site is configured with multiple sets of ETRs that support different EID-prefix mask-lengths, the database mapping system may have overlapping EID-prefixes. When overlapping EID-prefixes exist, a Map-Request with an EID that best matches any EID-Prefix MUST be returned in a single Map-Reply message. For instance, if an ETR had database mapping entries for EID-Prefixes:
A Map-Request for EID 2001:db8:1:1::1 would cause a Map-Reply with a record count of 1 to be returned with a mapping record EID-Prefix of 2001:db8:1:1::/64.

A Map-Request for EID 2001:db8:1:5::5 would cause a Map-Reply with a record count of 3 to be returned with mapping records for EID-Prefixes 2001:db8:1::/48, 2001:db8:1:1::/64, 2001:db8:1:2::/64, filling out the /48 with more-specifics that exist in the mapping system.

Note that not all overlapping EID-Prefixes need to be returned but only the more-specific entries (note that in the second example above 2001:db8::/32 was not returned for requesting EID 2001:db8:1:5::5) for the matching EID-Prefix of the requesting EID. When more than one EID-Prefix is returned, all SHOULD use the same Time to Live value so they can all time out at the same time. When a more-specific EID-Prefix is received later, its Time to Live value in the Map-Reply record can be stored even when other less-specific entries exist. When a less-specific EID-Prefix is received later, its Map-Cache expiration time SHOULD be set to the minimum expiration time of any more-specific EID-Prefix in the Map-Cache. This is done so the integrity of the EID-Prefix set is wholly maintained and so no more-specific entries are removed from the Map-Cache while keeping less-specific entries.

For scalability, it is expected that aggregation of EID addresses into EID-Prefixes will allow one Map-Reply to satisfy a mapping for the EID addresses in the prefix range, thereby reducing the number of Map-Request messages.

Map-Reply records can have an empty Locator-Set. A Negative Map-Reply is a Map-Reply with an empty Locator-Set. Negative Map-Replies convey special actions by the sender to the ITR or PITR that have solicited the Map-Reply. There are two primary applications for Negative Map-Replies. The first is for a Map-Resolver to instruct an ITR or PITR when a destination is for a LISP site versus a non-LISP site, and the other is to source quench Map-Requests that are sent for non-allocated EIDs.

For each Map-Reply record, the list of Locators in a Locator-Set MUST be sorted in order of ascending IP address where an IPv4 locator address is considered numerically 'less than' an IPv6 locator address.
When sending a Map-Reply message, the destination address is copied from one of the 'ITR-RLOC' fields from the Map-Request. The ETR can choose a locator address from one of the address families it supports. For Data-Probes, the destination address of the Map-Reply is copied from the source address of the Data-Probe message that is invoking the reply. The source address of the Map-Reply is one of the local IP addresses chosen, to allow Unicast Reverse Path Forwarding (uRPF) checks to succeed in the upstream service provider. The destination port of a Map-Reply message is copied from the source port of the Map-Request or Data-Probe, and the source port of the Map-Reply message is set to the well-known UDP port 4342.
This section specifies the encoding format for the Map-Register message. The message is sent in UDP with a destination UDP port of 4342 and a randomly selected UDP source port number.

The fields below are used in multiple control messages. They are defined for Map-Register, Map-Notify and Map-Notify-Ack message types.

The Map-Register message format is:

```
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| Type=3   | P | S | I | Reserved |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| E | T | a | R | M | Record Count |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| Nonce . . |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| . . . Nonce |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| Key ID | Algorithm ID | Authentication Data Length |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| Authentication Data |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| R | Locator Count | EID mask-len | ACT | A | Reserved |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| Rsvd | Map-Version Number | EID-Prefix-API |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| EID-Prefix |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| / | Priority | Weight | M Priority | M Weight |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| L | Unused Flags | L | p | R | Loc-API |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| \ | Locator |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+----------+
```

Packet field descriptions:

**Type:** 3 (Map-Register)

**P:** This is the proxy Map-Reply bit. When set to 1, the ETR sending the Map-Register message is requesting the Map-Server to proxy a Map-Reply. The Map-Server will send non-authoritative Map-Replies on behalf of the ETR.
S: This is the security-capable bit. When set, the procedures from [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec] are supported.

I: This is the ID-present bit. This bit is set to 1 to indicate that a 128 bit xTR-ID and a 64 bit Site-ID fields are present at the end of the Map-Register message. If an xTR is configured with an xTR-ID and Site-ID, it MUST set the I bit to 1 and include its xTR-ID and Site-ID in the Map-Register messages it generates. The combination of Site-ID plus xTR-ID uniquely identifies an xTR in a LISP domain and serves to track its last seen nonce.

Reserved: This unassigned field MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

E: This is the Map-Register EID-notify bit. This is used by a First-Hop-Router (FHR) which discovers a dynamic-EID. This EID-notify based Map-Register is sent by the FHR to a same site xTR that propagates the Map-Register to the mapping system. The site xTR keeps state to later Map-Notify the FHR after the EID has moves away. See [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] for a detailed use-case.

T: This is the use-TTL for timeout bit. When set to 1, the xTR wants the Map-Server to time out registrations based on the value in the "Record TTL" field of this message. Otherwise, the default timeout described in Section 8.2 is used.

a: This is the merge-request bit. When set to 1, the xTR requests to merge RLOC-records from different xTRs registering the same EID-record. See signal-free multicast [RFC8378] for one use case example.

R: This reserved and unassigned bit MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

M: This is the want-map-notify bit. When set to 1, an ETR is requesting a Map-Notify message to be returned in response to sending a Map-Register message. The Map-Notify message sent by a Map-Server is used to acknowledge receipt of a Map-Register message.

Record Count: This is the number of records in this Map-Register message. A record is comprised of that portion of the packet labeled ‘Record’ above and occurs the number of times equal to Record Count.

Nonce: This 8-octet ‘Nonce’ field is incremented each time a Map-Register message is sent. When a Map-Register acknowledgement is requested, the nonce is returned by Map-Servers in Map-Notify
messages. Since the entire Map-Register message is authenticated, the 'Nonce' field serves to protect against Map-Register replay attacks. An ETR that registers to the mapping system SHOULD store the last nonce sent in persistent storage so when it restarts it can continue using an incrementing nonce. If the ETR cannot support saving the nonce, then when it restarts it MUST use a new authentication key to register to the mapping system. A Map-Server MUST track and save in persistent storage the last nonce received for each ETR xTR-ID and key pair. If a Map-Register is received with a nonce value that is not greater than the saved nonce, it MUST drop the Map-Register message and SHOULD log the fact a replay attack could have occurred.

Key ID: A key-id value that identifies a pre-shared secret between an ETR and a Map-Server. Per-message keys are derived from the pre-shared secret to authenticate the origin and protect the integrity of the Map-Register. The Key ID allows to rotate between multiple pre-shared secrets in a non-disruptive way. The pre-shared secret MUST be unique per each LISP "Site-ID".

Algorithm ID: This field identifies the Key Derivation Function (KDF) and Message Authentication Code (MAC) algorithms used to derive the key and to compute the Authentication Data of a Map-Register. This 8-bit field identifies the KDF and MAC algorithm pair. See Section 12.5 for codepoint assignments.

Authentication Data Length: This is the length in octets of the 'Authentication Data' field that follows this field. The length of the 'Authentication Data' field is dependent on the MAC algorithm used. The length field allows a device that doesn’t know the MAC algorithm to correctly parse the packet.

Authentication Data: This is the output of the MAC algorithm placed in this field after the MAC computation. The MAC output is computed as follows:

1: The KDF algorithm is identified by the field 'Algorithm ID' according to the table in Section 12.5. Implementations of this specification MUST implement HMAC-SHA-256-128 [RFC4868] and SHOULD implement HMAC-SHA-256-128+HKDF-SHA256 [RFC5869].

2: The MAC algorithm is identified by the field 'Algorithm ID' according to the table in Section 12.5.
3: The pre-shared secret used to derive the per-message key is represented by PSK[Key ID], that is the pre-shared secret identified by the 'Key ID'.

4: The derived per-message key is computed as: per-msg-key=KDF(nonce+PSK[Key ID],s). Where the nonce is the value in the Nonce field of the Map-Register, '+' denotes concatenation and 's' (the salt) is a string that corresponds to the message type being authenticated. For Map-Register messages, it is equal to "Map-Register Authentication". Similarly, for Map-Notify and Map-Notify-Ack messages, it is "Map-Notify Authentication" and "Map-Notify-Ack Authentication", respectively. For those Algorithm IDs defined in Section 12.5 that specify a 'none' KDF, the per-message key is computed as: per-msg-key = PSK[Key ID]. This means that the same key is used across multiple protocol messages.

5: The MAC output is computed using the MAC algorithm and the per-msg-key over the entire Map-Register payload (from and including the LISP message type field through the end of the last RLOC record) with the authenticated data field preset to 0.

The definition of the rest of the Map-Register can be found in EID-record description in Section 5.4. When the I-bit is set, the following fields are added to the end of the Map-Register message:

xTR-ID: xTR-ID is a 128 bit field at the end of the Map-Register message, starting after the final Record in the message. The xTR-ID is used to uniquely identify a xTR. The same xTR-ID value MUST NOT be used in two different xTRs in the scope of the Site-ID.

Site-ID: Site-ID is a 64 bit field at the end of the Map-Register message, following the xTR-ID. Site-ID is used to uniquely identify to which site the xTR that sent the message belongs. This document does not specify a strict meaning for the Site-ID field. Informally it provides an indication that a group of xTRs have some relation, either administratively, topologically or otherwise.
5.7. Map-Notify/Map-Notify-Ack Message Format

This section specifies the encoding format for the Map-Notify and Map-Notify-Ack messages. The messages are sent inside a UDP packet with source and destination UDP ports equal to 4342.

The Map-Notify and Map-Notify-Ack message formats are:

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Type=4/5| Reserved | Record Count |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Nonce . . . |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| . . . Nonce |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Key ID | Algorithm ID | Authentication Data Length |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Authentication Data |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Record TTL|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Locator Count | EID mask-len | ACT | A | Reserved |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| EID mask-len | ACT | A | Reserved |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Map-Version Number | EID-Prefix-AFI |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|EID-Prefix |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|EID-Prefix |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Priority | Weight | M Priority | M Weight |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Unused Flags | L|p|R | Loc-AFI |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Loc-AFI |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Loc-AFI |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Loc-AFI |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Packet field descriptions:

**Type:** 4/5 (Map-Notify/Map-Notify-Ack)

The Map-Notify message has the same contents as a Map-Register message. See the Map-Register section for field descriptions and the Map-Reply section for EID-record and RLOC-record descriptions.

The fields of the Map-Notify are copied from the corresponding Map-Register to acknowledge its correct processing. In the Map-Notify, the 'Authentication Data' field is recomputed using the corresponding per-message key and according to the procedure defined in the
previous section. The Map-Notify message can also be used, outside the scope of this specification, in an unsolicited manner, such as is specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-pubsub].

After sending a Map-Register, if a Map-Notify is not received after 1 second the transmitter MUST re-transmit the original Map-Register with an exponential backoff (base of 2, that is, the next backoff timeout interval is doubled), the maximum backoff is 1 minute. Map-Notify messages are only transmitted upon the reception of a Map-Register with the M-bit set, Map-Notify messages are not retransmitted. The only exception to this is for unsolicited Map-Notify messages, see below.

A Map-Server sends an unsolicited Map-Notify message (one that is not used as an acknowledgment to a Map-Register message) only in conformance with the Congestion Control And Reliability Guideline sections of [RFC8085]. A Map-Notify is retransmitted until a Map-Notify-Ack is received by the Map-Server with the same nonce used in the Map-Notify message. An implementation SHOULD retransmit up to 3 times at 3 second retransmission intervals, after which time the retransmission interval is exponentially backed-off (base of 2, that is, the next backoff timeout interval is doubled) for another 3 retransmission attempts. Map-Notify-Ack messages are only transmitted upon the reception of an unsolicited Map-Notify, Map-Notify-Ack messages are not retransmitted.

The Map-Notify-Ack message has the same contents as a Map-Notify message. It is used to acknowledge the receipt of an unsolicited Map-Notify and, once the the authentication data is validated, allows for the sender to stop retransmitting a Map-Notify with the same nonce and the authentication data validates. The fields of the Map-Notify-Ack are copied from the corresponding Map-Notify message to acknowledge its correct processing. The 'Authentication Data' field is recomputed using the corresponding per-message key and according to the procedure defined in the previous section.

Upon reception of Map-Register, Map-Notify or Map-Notify-Ack, the receiver verifies the authentication data. If the authentication data fails to validate, the message is dropped without further processing.
5.8. Encapsulated Control Message Format

An Encapsulated Control Message (ECM) is used to encapsulate control packets sent between xTRs and the mapping database system or internal to the mapping database system.

```
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| OH: IPv4 or IPv6 Header        | UDP: Source Port = xxxx         | Dest Port = yyyy                |
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| (uses RLOC addresses)          | UDP Length                      | UDP Checksum                    |
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| LISP: Type=8 |S|D|R|R|                   | Reserved                        |
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| IH: IPv4 or IPv6 Header        |                                |                                |
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| (uses RLOC or EID addresses)   |                                |                                |
|                                |                                |                                |
|                                |                                |                                |
```

Packet header descriptions:

OH: The outer IPv4 or IPv6 header, which uses RLOC addresses in the source and destination header address fields.

UDP: The outer UDP header with destination port 4342. The source port is randomly allocated. The checksum field MUST be non-zero.

LISP: Type 8 is defined to be a "LISP Encapsulated Control Message", and what follows is either an IPv4 or IPv6 header as encoded by the first 4 bits after the ‘Reserved’ field, or the Authentication Data field [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec] if the S-bit (see below) is set.

Type: 8 (Encapsulated Control Message (ECM))
S:  This is the Security bit. When set to 1, the field following the 'Reserved' field will have the following Authentication Data format and follow the procedures from [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec].

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|    AD Type    |       Authentication Data Content . . .       |
| Authentication Data Content . . . |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

D:  This is the DDT-bit. When set to 1, the sender is requesting a Map-Referral message to be returned. The details of this procedure are described in [RFC8111].

R:  This reserved and unassigned bit MUST be set to 0 on transmit and MUST be ignored on receipt.

IH:  The inner IPv4 or IPv6 header, which can use either RLOC or EID addresses in the header address fields. When a Map-Request is encapsulated in this packet format, the destination address in this header is an EID.

UDP: The inner UDP header, where the port assignments depend on the control packet being encapsulated. When the control packet is a Map-Request or Map-Register, the source port is selected by the ITR/PITR and the destination port is 4342. When the control packet is a Map-Reply, the source port is 4342 and the destination port is assigned from the source port of the invoking Map-Request. Port number 4341 MUST NOT be assigned to either port. The checksum field MUST be non-zero.

LCM: The format is one of the control message formats described in Section 5. Map-Request messages are allowed to be Control-Plane (ECM) encapsulated. When Map-Requests are sent for RLOC-Probing purposes (i.e. the probe-bit is set), they MUST NOT be sent inside Encapsulated Control Messages. PIM Join/Prune messages [RFC6831] are also allowed to be Control-Plane (ECM) encapsulated.
6. Changing the Contents of EID-to-RLOC Mappings

In the LISP architecture ITRs/PITRs use a local Map-Cache to store EID-to-RLOC mappings for forwarding. When an ETR updates a mapping a mechanism is required to inform ITRs/PITRs that are using such mappings.

The LISP Data-Plane defines several mechanism to update mappings [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis]. This document specifies the Solicit-Map Request (SMR), a Control-Plane push-based mechanism. An additional Control-Plane mechanism based on the Publish/subscribe paradigm is specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-pubsub].

6.1. Solicit-Map-Request (SMR)

Soliciting a Map-Request is a selective way for ETRs, at the site where mappings change, to control the rate they receive requests for Map-Reply messages. SMRs are also used to tell remote ITRs to update the mappings they have cached.

Since ETRs are not required to keep track of remote ITRs that have cached their mappings, they do not know which ITRs need to have their mappings updated. As a result, an ETR will solicit Map-Requests to those sites to which it has been sending LISP encapsulated data packets for the last minute. As a result, when an ETR is also acting as ITR, it will send an SMR to an ITR to which it has recently sent encapsulated data.

An SMR message is simply a bit set in a Map-Request message. An ITR or PITR will send a Map-Request (SMR-invoked Map-Request) when they receive an SMR message. While the SMR message is sent through the data-plane, the SMR-invoked Map-Request MUST be sent through the Mapping System (not directly).

Both the SMR sender and the SMR responder MUST rate-limit these messages. It is RECOMMENDED that the SMR sender rate-limits Map-Request for the same destination RLOC to no more than one packet per 3 seconds. It is RECOMMENDED that the SMR responder rate-limits Map-Request for the same EID-Prefix to no more than once per 3 seconds.

When an ITR receives an SMR message for which it does not have a cached mapping for the EID in the SMR message, it SHOULD NOT send an SMR-invoked Map-Request. This scenario can occur when an ETR sends SMR messages to all Locators in the Locator-Set it has stored in its Map-Cache but the remote ITRs that receive the SMR may not be sending packets to the site. There is no point in updating the ITRs until they need to send, in which case they will send Map-Requests to obtain a Map-Cache entry.
7. Routing Locator Reachability

This document defines several Control-Plane mechanisms for determining RLOC reachability. Please note that additional Data-Plane reachability mechanisms are defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis].

1. An ITR may receive an ICMP Network Unreachable or Host Unreachable message for an RLOC it is using. This indicates that the RLOC is likely down. Note that trusting ICMP messages may not be desirable, but neither is ignoring them completely. Implementations are encouraged to follow current best practices in treating these conditions [I-D.ietf-opsec-icmp-filtering].

2. When an ITR participates in the routing protocol that operates in the underlay routing system, it can determine that an RLOC is down when no Routing Information Base (RIB) entry exists that matches the RLOC IP address.

3. An ITR may receive an ICMP Port Unreachable message from a destination host. This occurs if an ITR attempts to use interworking [RFC6832] and LISP-encapsulated data is sent to a non-LISP-capable site.

4. An ITR may receive a Map-Reply from an ETR in response to a previously sent Map-Request. The RLOC source of the Map-Reply is likely up, since the ETR was able to send the Map-Reply to the ITR. Please note that in some scenarios the RLOC -from the outer header- can be an spoofable field.

5. An ITR/ETR pair can use the 'RLOC-Probing' mechanism described below.

When ITRs receive ICMP Network Unreachable or Host Unreachable messages as a method to determine unreachability, they will refrain from using Locators that are described in Locator lists of Map-Replies. However, using this approach is unreliable because many network operators turn off generation of ICMP Destination Unreachable messages.

If an ITR does receive an ICMP Network Unreachable or Host Unreachable message, it MAY originate its own ICMP Destination Unreachable message destined for the host that originated the data packet the ITR encapsulated.

This assumption does create a dependency: Locator unreachability is detected by the receipt of ICMP Host Unreachable messages. When a Locator has been determined to be unreachable, it is not used for
active traffic; this is the same as if it were listed in a Map-Reply with Priority 255.

The ITR can test the reachability of the unreachable Locator by sending periodic Map-Requests. Both Map-Requests and Map-Replies MUST be rate-limited, see Section 5.3 and Section 5.4 for information about rate-limiting. Locator reachability testing is never done with data packets, since that increases the risk of packet loss for end-to-end sessions.

7.1. RLOC-Probing Algorithm

RLOC-Probing is a method that an ITR or PITR can use to determine the reachability status of one or more Locators that it has cached in a Map-Cache entry. The probe-bit of the Map-Request and Map-Reply messages is used for RLOC-Probing.

RLOC-Probing is done in the control plane on a timer basis, where an ITR or PITR will originate a Map-Request destined to a locator address from one of its own locator addresses. A Map-Request used as an RLOC-probe is NOT encapsulated and NOT sent to a Map-Server or to the mapping database system as one would when requesting mapping data. The EID record encoded in the Map-Request is the EID-Prefix of the Map-Cache entry cached by the ITR or PITR. The ITR MAY include a mapping data record for its own database mapping information that contains the local EID-Prefixes and RLOCs for its site. RLOC-probes are sent periodically using a jittered timer interval.

When an ETR receives a Map-Request message with the probe-bit set, it returns a Map-Reply with the probe-bit set. The source address of the Map-Reply is set to the IP address of the outgoing interface the Map-Reply destination address routes to. The Map-Reply SHOULD contain mapping data for the EID-Prefix contained in the Map-Request. This provides the opportunity for the ITR or PITR that sent the RLOC-probe to get mapping updates if there were changes to the ETR’s database mapping entries.

There are advantages and disadvantages of RLOC-Probing. The main benefit of RLOC-Probing is that it can handle many failure scenarios allowing the ITR to determine when the path to a specific Locator is reachable or has become unreachable, thus providing a robust mechanism for switching to using another Locator from the cached Locator. RLOC-Probing can also provide rough Round-Trip Time (RTT) estimates between a pair of Locators, which can be useful for network management purposes as well as for selecting low delay paths. The major disadvantage of RLOC-Probing is in the number of control messages required and the amount of bandwidth used to obtain those
benefits, especially if the requirement for failure detection times is very small.

8. Interactions with Other LISP Components

8.1. ITR EID-to-RLOC Mapping Resolution

An ITR is configured with one or more Map-Resolver addresses. These addresses are "Locators" (or RLOCs) and MUST be routable on the underlying core network; they MUST NOT need to be resolved through LISP EID-to-RLOC mapping, as that would introduce a circular dependency. When using a Map-Resolver, an ITR does not need to connect to any other database mapping system.

An ITR sends an Encapsulated Map-Request to a configured Map-Resolver when it needs an EID-to-RLOC mapping that is not found in its local Map-Cache. Using the Map-Resolver greatly reduces both the complexity of the ITR implementation and the costs associated with its operation.

In response to an Encapsulated Map-Request, the ITR can expect one of the following:

- An immediate Negative Map-Reply (with action code of "Natively-Forward", 15-minute Time to Live (TTL)) from the Map-Resolver if the Map-Resolver can determine that the requested EID does not exist. The ITR saves the EID-Prefix returned in the Map-Reply in its cache, marks it as non-LISP-capable, and knows not to attempt LISP encapsulation for destinations matching it.

- A Negative Map-Reply, with action code of "Natively-Forward", from a Map-Server that is authoritative (within the LISP deployment Section 1.1) for an EID-Prefix that matches the requested EID but that does not have an actively registered, more-specific EID-prefix. In this case, the requested EID is said to match a "hole" in the authoritative EID-Prefix. If the requested EID matches a more-specific EID-Prefix that has been delegated by the Map-Server but for which no ETRs are currently registered, a 1-minute TTL is returned. If the requested EID matches a non-delegated part of the authoritative EID-Prefix, then it is not a LISP EID and a 15-minute TTL is returned. See Section 8.2 for discussion of aggregate EID-Prefixes and details of Map-Server EID-Prefix matching.

- A LISP Map-Reply from the ETR that owns the EID-to-RLOC mapping or possibly from a Map-Server answering on behalf of the ETR. See Section 8.4 for more details on Map-Resolver message processing.
Note that an ITR may be configured to both use a Map-Resolver and to participate in a LISP-ALT logical network. In such a situation, the ITR SHOULD send Map-Requests through the ALT network for any EID-Prefix learned via ALT BGP. Such a configuration is expected to be very rare, since there is little benefit to using a Map-Resolver if an ITR is already using LISP-ALT. There would be, for example, no need for such an ITR to send a Map-Request to a possibly non-existent EID (and rely on Negative Map-Replies) if it can consult the ALT database to verify that an EID-Prefix is present before sending that Map-Request.

8.2. EID-Prefix Configuration and ETR Registration

An ETR publishes its EID-Prefixes on a Map-Server by sending LISP Map-Register messages. A Map-Register message includes authentication data, so prior to sending a Map-Register message, the ETR and Map-Server MUST be configured with a pre-shared secret used to derive Map-Register authentication keys. A Map-Server’s configuration SHOULD also include a list of the EID-Prefixes for which each ETR is authoritative. Upon receipt of a Map-Register from an ETR, a Map-Server accepts only EID-Prefixes that are configured for that ETR. Failure to implement such a check would leave the mapping system vulnerable to trivial EID-Prefix hijacking attacks.

In addition to the set of EID-Prefixes defined for each ETR that may register, a Map-Server is typically also configured with one or more aggregate prefixes that define the part of the EID numbering space assigned to it. When LISP-ALT is the database in use, aggregate EID-Prefixes are implemented as discard routes and advertised into ALT BGP. The existence of aggregate EID-Prefixes in a Map-Server’s database means that it may receive Map Requests for EID-Prefixes that match an aggregate but do not match a registered prefix; Section 8.3 describes how this is handled.

Map-Register messages are sent periodically from an ETR to a Map-Server with a suggested interval between messages of one minute. A Map-Server SHOULD time out and remove an ETR’s registration if it has not received a valid Map-Register message within the past three minutes. When first contacting a Map-Server after restart or changes to its EID-to-RLOC database mappings, an ETR MAY initially send Map-Register messages at an increased frequency, up to one every 20 seconds. This "quick registration" period is limited to five minutes in duration.

An ETR MAY request that a Map-Server explicitly acknowledge receipt and processing of a Map-Register message by setting the "want-map-notify" (M-bit) flag. A Map-Server that receives a Map-Register with this flag set will respond with a Map-Notify message. Typical use of
this flag by an ETR would be to set it for Map-Register messages sent
during the initial "quick registration" with a Map-Server but then
set it only occasionally during steady-state maintenance of its
association with that Map-Server. Note that the Map-Notify message
is sent to UDP destination port 4342, not to the source port
specified in the original Map-Register message.

Note that a one-minute minimum registration interval during
maintenance of an ETR-Map-Server association places a lower bound on
how quickly and how frequently a mapping database entry can be
updated. This may have implications for what sorts of mobility can
be supported directly by the mapping system; shorter registration
intervals or other mechanisms might be needed to support faster
mobility in some cases. For a discussion on one way that faster
mobility may be implemented for individual devices, please see
[I-D.ietf-lisp-mn].

An ETR MAY also request, by setting the "proxy Map-Reply" flag
(P-bit) in the Map-Register message, that a Map-Server answer Map-
Requests instead of forwarding them to the ETR. See Section 7.1 for
details on how the Map-Server sets certain flags (such as those
indicating whether the message is authoritative and how returned
Locators SHOULD be treated) when sending a Map-Reply on behalf of an
ETR. When an ETR requests proxy reply service, it SHOULD include all
RLOCs for all ETRs for the EID-Prefix being registered, along with
the routable flag ("R-bit") setting for each RLOC. The Map-Server
includes all of this information in Map-Reply messages that it sends
on behalf of the ETR. This differs from a non-proxy registration,
since the latter need only provide one or more RLOCs for a Map-Server
to use for forwarding Map-Requests; the registration information is
not used in Map-Replies, so it being incomplete is not incorrect.

An ETR that uses a Map-Server to publish its EID-to-RLOC mappings
does not need to participate further in the mapping database
protocol(s). When using a LISP-ALT mapping database, for example,
this means that the ETR does not need to implement GRE or BGP, which
greatly simplifies its configuration and reduces its cost of
operation.

Note that use of a Map-Server does not preclude an ETR from also
connecting to the mapping database (i.e., it could also connect to
the LISP-ALT network), but doing so doesn't seem particularly useful,
as the whole purpose of using a Map-Server is to avoid the complexity
of the mapping database protocols.
8.3. Map-Server Processing

Once a Map-Server has EID-Prefixes registered by its client ETRs, it can accept and process Map-Requests for them.

In response to a Map-Request, the Map-Server first checks to see if the destination EID matches a configured EID-Prefix. If there is no match, the Map-Server returns a Negative Map-Reply with action code "Natively-Forward" and a 15-minute TTL. This can occur if a Map Request is received for a configured aggregate EID-Prefix for which no more-specific EID-Prefix exists; it indicates the presence of a non-LISP "hole" in the aggregate EID-Prefix.

Next, the Map-Server checks to see if any ETRs have registered the matching EID-Prefix. If none are found, then the Map-Server returns a Negative Map-Reply with action code "Natively-Forward" and a 1-minute TTL.

If the EID-prefix is either registered or not registered to the mapping system and there is a policy in the Map-Server to have the requestor drop packets for the matching EID-prefix, then a Drop/Policy-Denied action is returned. If the EID-prefix is registered or not registered and there is an authentication failure, then a Drop/Authentication-failure action is returned. If either of these actions result as a temporary state in policy or authentication then a Send-Map-Request action with 1-minute TTL MAY be returned to allow the requestor to retry the Map-Request.

If any of the registered ETRs for the EID-Prefix have requested proxy reply service, then the Map-Server answers the request instead of forwarding it. It returns a Map-Reply with the EID-Prefix, RLOCs, and other information learned through the registration process.

If none of the ETRs have requested proxy reply service, then the Map-Server re-encapsulates and forwards the resulting Encapsulated Map-Request to one of the registered ETRs. It does not otherwise alter the Map-Request, so any Map-Reply sent by the ETR is returned to the RLOC in the Map-Request, not to the Map-Server. Unless also acting as a Map-Resolver, a Map-Server should never receive Map-Replies; any such messages SHOULD be discarded without response, perhaps accompanied by the logging of a diagnostic message if the rate of Map-Replies is suggestive of malicious traffic.

8.4. Map-Resolver Processing

Upon receipt of an Encapsulated Map-Request, a Map-Resolver decapsulates the enclosed message and then searches for the requested EID in its local database of mapping entries (statically configured
or learned from associated ETRs if the Map-Resolver is also a Map-
Server offering proxy reply service). If it finds a matching entry, it returns a LISP Map-Reply with the known mapping.

If the Map-Resolver does not have the mapping entry and if it can
determine that the EID is not in the mapping database (for example, if LISP-ALT is used, the Map-Resolver will have an ALT forwarding
table that covers the full EID space), it immediately returns a
negative LISP Map-Reply, with action code "Natively-Forward" and a
15-minute TTL. To minimize the number of negative cache entries
needed by an ITR, the Map-Resolver SHOULD return the least-specific
prefix that both matches the original query and does not match any
EID-Prefix known to exist in the LISP-capable infrastructure.

If the Map-Resolver does not have sufficient information to know
whether the EID exists, it needs to forward the Map-Request to
another device that has more information about the EID being
requested. To do this, it forwards the unencapsulated Map-Request,
with the original ITR RLOC as the source, to the mapping database
system. Using LISP-ALT, the Map-Resolver is connected to the ALT
network and sends the Map-Request to the next ALT hop learned from
its ALT BGP neighbors. The Map-Resolver does not send any response
to the ITR; since the source RLOC is that of the ITR, the ETR or Map-
Server that receives the Map-Request over the ALT and responds will
do so directly to the ITR.

8.4.1. Anycast Operation

A Map-Resolver can be set up to use "anycast", where the same address
is assigned to multiple Map-Resolvers and is propagated through IGP
routing, to facilitate the use of a topologically close Map-Resolver
by each ITR.

ETRs MAY have anycast RLOC addresses which are registered as part of
their RLOC-set to the mapping system. However, registrations MUST
use their unique RLOC addresses, distinct authentication keys or
different XTR-IDs to identify security associations with the Map-
Servers.

9. Security Considerations

A LISP threat analysis can be found in [RFC7835]. In what follows we
highlight security considerations that apply when LISP is deployed in
environments such as those specified in Section 1.1, where the
following assumptions hold:
1. The Mapping System is secure and trusted, and for the purpose of this security considerations the Mapping System is considered as one trusted element.

2. The ETRs have a pre-configured trust relationship with the Mapping System, which includes some form of shared secret, and the Mapping System is aware of which EIDs an ETR can advertise. How those keys and mappings gets established is out of the scope of this document.

3. LISP-SEC [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec] MUST be implemented. Network operators should carefully weight how the LISP-SEC threat model applies to their particular use case or deployment. If they decide to ignore a particular recommendation, they should make sure the risk associated with the corresponding threats is well understood.

The Map-Request/Map-Reply message exchange can be exploited by an attacker to mount DoS and/or amplification attacks. Attackers can send Map-Requests at high rates to overload LISP nodes and increase the state maintained by such nodes or consume CPU cycles. Such threats can be mitigated by systematically applying filters and rate limiters.

The Map-Request/Map-Reply message exchange can also be exploited to inject forged mappings directly in the ITR EID-to-RLOC map-cache. This can lead to traffic being redirected to the attacker, see further details in [RFC7835]. In addition, valid ETRs in the system can perform overclaiming attacks. In this case, attackers can claim to own an EID-prefix that is larger than the prefix owned by the ETR. Such attacks can be addressed by using LISP-SEC [I-D.ietf-lisp-sec]. The LISP-SEC protocol defines a mechanism for providing origin authentication, integrity protection, and prevention of 'man-in-the-middle' and 'prefix overclaiming' attacks on the Map-Request/Map-Reply exchange. In addition and while beyond the scope of securing an individual Map-Server or Map-Resolver, it should be noted that LISP-SEC can be complemented by additional security mechanisms defined by the Mapping System Infrastructure. For instance, BGP-based LISP-ALT [RFC6836] can take advantage of standards work on adding security to BGP while LISP-DDT [RFC8111] defines its own additional security mechanisms.

To publish an authoritative EID-to-RLOC mapping with a Map-Server using the Map-Register message, an ETR includes authentication data that is a MAC of the entire message using a key derived from the pre-shared secret. An implementation SHOULD support HMAC-SHA256-128+HKDF-SHA256 [RFC5869]. The Map-Register message includes protection for replay attacks by a man-in-the-middle. However, there
is a potential attack where a compromised ETR could overclaim the prefix it owns and successfully register it on its corresponding Map-Server. To mitigate this and as noted in Section 8.2, a Map-Server MUST verify that all EID-Prefixes registered by an ETR match the configuration stored on the Map-Server.

Deployments concerned about manipulations of Map-Request and Map-Reply messages, and malicious ETR EID prefix overclaiming MUST drop LISP Control Plane messages that do not contain LISP-SEC material (S-bit, EID-AD, OTK-AD, PKT-AD).

Mechanisms to encrypt, support privacy, prevent eavesdropping and packet tampering for messages exchanged between xTRs, xTRs and the mapping system, and nodes that make up the mapping system, SHOULD be deployed. Examples of this are DTLS [RFC6347] or LISP-crypto [RFC8061].

10. Privacy Considerations

As noted by [RFC6973] privacy is a complex issue that greatly depends on the specific protocol use-case and deployment. As noted in section 1.1 of [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] LISP focuses on use-cases where entities communicate over the public Internet while keeping separate addressing and topology. In what follows we detail the privacy threats introduced by the LISP Control Plane, the analysis is based on the guidelines detailed in [RFC6973].

LISP can use long-lived identifiers (EIDs) that survive mobility events. Such identifiers bind to the RLOCs of the nodes, which represents the topological location with respect to the specific LISP deployments. In addition, EID-to-RLOC mappings are typically considered public information within the LISP deployment when control-plane messages are not encrypted, and can be eavesdropped while Map-Request messages are sent to the corresponding Map-Resolvers or Map-Register messages to Map-Servers.

In this context, attackers can correlate the EID with the RLOC and track the corresponding user topological location and/or mobility. This can be achieved by off-path attackers, if they are authenticated, by querying the mapping system. Deployments concerned about this threat can use access control-lists or stronger authentication mechanisms [I-D.ietf-lisp-ecdsa-auth] in the mapping system to make sure that only authorized users can access this information (data minimization). Use of ephemeral EIDs [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-anonymity] to achieve anonymity is another mechanism to lessen persistency and identity tracking.
11. Changes since RFC 6833

For implementation considerations, the following major changes have been made to this document since RFC 6833 was published:

- A Map-Notify-Ack message is added in this document to provide reliability for Map-Notify messages. Any receiver of a Map-Notify message must respond with a Map-Notify-Ack message. Map-Servers who are senders of Map-Notify messages, must queue the Map-Notify contents until they receive a Map-Notify-Ack with the nonce used in the Map-Notify message. Note that implementations for Map-Notify-Ack support already exist and predate this document.

- This document is incorporating the codepoint for the Map-Referral message from the LISP-DDT specification [RFC8111] to indicate that a Map-Server must send the final Map-Referral message when it participates in the LISP-DDT mapping system procedures.

- The L" and "D" bits are added to the Map-Request message. See Section 5.3 for details.

- The "S", "I", "E", "T", "a", "R", and "M" bits are added to the Map-Register message. See Section 5.6 for details.

- The 16-bit Key-ID field of the Map-Register message has been split into a 8-bit Key-ID field and a 8-bit Algorithm-ID field.

- The nonce and the authentication data in the Map-Register message have a different behaviour, see Section 5.6 for details.

- This document adds two new Action values that are in an EID-record that appear in Map-Reply, Map-Register, Map-Notify, and Map-Notify-Ack messages. The Drop/Policy-Denied and Drop/Auth-Failure are the descriptions for the two new action values. See Section 5.4 for details.

12. IANA Considerations

This section provides guidance to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) regarding registration of values related to this LISP Control-Plane specification, in accordance with BCP 26 [RFC8126].

There are three namespaces (listed in the sub-sections below) in LISP that have been registered.

- LISP IANA registry allocations should not be made for purposes unrelated to LISP routing or transport protocols.
The following policies are used here with the meanings defined in BCP 26: "Specification Required", "IETF Review", "Experimental Use", and "First Come First Served".

12.1. LISP UDP Port Numbers

The IANA registry has allocated UDP port number 4342 for the LISP Control-Plane. IANA has updated the description for UDP port 4342 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Transport Layer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lisp-control</td>
<td>4342</td>
<td>udp</td>
<td>LISP Control Packets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2. LISP Packet Type Codes

It is being requested that the IANA be authoritative for LISP Packet Type definitions and it is requested to replace the [RFC6830] registry message references with the RFC number assigned to this document.

Based on deployment experience of [RFC6830], the Map-Notify-Ack message, message type 5, was added by this document. This document requests IANA to add it to the LISP Packet Type Registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Defined in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LISP Map-Notify-Ack</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RFC6833bis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.3. LISP Map-Reply EID-Record Action Codes

New ACT values can be allocated through IETF review or IESG approval. Four values have already been allocated by [RFC6830]. IANA is requested to replace the [RFC6830] reference for this registry with the RFC number assigned to this document and [RFC6830]. This specification changes the name of ACT type 3 value from "Drop" to "Drop/No-Reason" as well as adding two new ACT values, the "Drop/Policy-Denied" (type 4) and "Drop/Authentication-Failure" (type 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drop/Policy-Denied</td>
<td>A packet matching this Map-Cache entry is dropped because the target EWID is policy-denied by the xTR or the mapping system.</td>
<td>RFC6833bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drop/Auth-Failure</td>
<td>Packet matching the Map-Cache entry is dropped because the Map-Request for the target EID fails an authentication check by the xTR or the mapping system.</td>
<td>RFC6833bis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LISP Map-Reply Action Values

In addition, LISP has a number of flag fields and reserved fields, such as the LISP header flags field [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis]. New bits for flags in these fields can be implemented after IETF review or IESG approval, but these need not be managed by IANA.

12.4. LISP Address Type Codes

LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) [RFC8060] is an 8-bit field that defines LISP-specific encodings for AFI value 16387. LCAF encodings are used for specific use-cases where different address types for EID-records and RLOC-records are required.

The IANA registry "LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF) Types" is used for LCAF types. The registry for LCAF types uses the Specification Required policy [RFC8126]. Initial values for the registry as well as further information can be found in [RFC8060].

Therefore, there is no longer a need for the "LISP Address Type Codes" registry requested by [RFC6830]. This document requests to remove it.

12.5. LISP Algorithm ID Numbers

In [RFC6830], a request for a "LISP Key ID Numbers" registry was submitted. This document renames the registry to "LISP Algorithm ID Numbers" and requests the IANA to make the name change.
The following Algorithm ID values are defined by this specification as used in any packet type that references a 'Algorithm ID' field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>KDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMAC-SHA-1-96-None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[RFC2404]</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMAC-SHA-256-128-None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[RFC4868]</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMAC-SHA256-128+HKDF-SHA256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[RFC4868]</td>
<td>[RFC4868]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number values are in the range of 0 to 255. The allocation of values is on a first come first served basis.

12.6. LISP Bit Flags

This document asks IANA to create a registry for allocation of bits in several headers of the LISP control plane, namely in the Map-Request, Map-Reply, Map-Register, Encapsulated Control Message (ECM) messages. Bit allocations are also requested for EID-records and RLOC-records. The registry created should be named "LISP Control Plane Header Bits". A sub-registry needs to be created per each message and EID-record. The name of each sub-registry is indicated below, along with its format and allocation of bits defined in this document. Any additional bits allocation, requires a specification, according with [RFC8126] policies.

Sub-Registry: Map-Request Header Bits [Section 5.2]:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Type=1 |A|M|P|S|p|s|R|R|  Rsvd   |L|D|   IRC   | Record Count  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```
### LISP Map-Request Header Bits

Sub-Registry: Map-Reply Header Bits [Section 5.4]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec Name</th>
<th>IANA Name</th>
<th>Bit Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>map-request-A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Authoritative Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>map-request-M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Map Data Present Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>map-request-P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RLOC-Probe Request Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>map-request-S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Solicit Map-Request (SMR) Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>map-request-p</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proxy-ITR Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>map-request-s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Solicit Map-Request Invoked Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>map-request-L</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Local xTR Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>map-request-D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Don’t Map-Reply Bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LISP Map-Reply Header Bits

Sub-Registry: Map-Register Header Bits [Section 5.6]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec Name</th>
<th>IANA Name</th>
<th>Bit Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>map-reply-P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RLOC-Probe Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>map-reply-E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Echo Nonce Capable Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>map-reply-S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Security Bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+-----------+----------------+--------------+----------------------+
| Spec Name | IANA Name      | Bit Position | Description          |
+-----------+----------------+--------------+----------------------+
| P         | map-register-P | 4            | Proxy Map-Reply Bit  |
| S         | map-register-S | 5            | LISP-SEC Capable Bit |
| I         | map-register-I | 6            | xTR-ID present flag  |
+-----------+----------------+--------------+----------------------+

### LISP Map-Register Header Bits

Sub-Registry: Encapsulated Control Message (ECM) Header Bits

[Section 5.8]:

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Type=8 |S|D|E|M|            Reserved                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec Name</th>
<th>IANA Name</th>
<th>Bit Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ecm-S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Security Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ecm-D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LISP-DDT Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ecm-E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Forward to ETR Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ecm-M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Destined to Map-Server Bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LISP Encapsulated Control Message (ECM) Header Bits

Sub-Registry: EID-Record Header Bits [Section 5.4]:

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Locator Count | EID mask-len  | ACT |A|      Reserved         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec Name</th>
<th>IANA Name</th>
<th>Bit Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>eid-record-A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Authoritative Bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LISP EID-Record Header Bits

Sub-Registry: RLOC-Record Header Bits [Section 5.4]:

---

LISP RLOC-Record Header Bits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec Name</th>
<th>IANA Name</th>
<th>Bit Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>rloc-record-L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Local RLOC Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>rloc-record-p</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>RLOC-Probe Reply Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>rloc-record-R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>RLOC Reachable Bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

The main motivation for this specification is to provide a methodology for the interconnection of LISP domains that may use disparate control and/or data plane approaches. For instance, one domain may use native LISP encapsulation for its data plane and a DDT based mapping system, while another domain may use VXLAN-GPE encapsulation and a mapping system based on [I-D.farinacci-lisp-decent]. Furthermore, one domain may use an IPv4 RLOC space and the other domain may use an IPv6 RLOC space and there may not be connectivity between the domains at the RLOC level. We propose a method to interconnect and enable interoperability between these disparate LISP overlay networks by connecting them to a common transit LISP overlay.

In order to provide interworking across implementations of overlays that may use different control and data plane approaches, a LISP network may be structured as a collection of site-overlays interconnected by a transit area. Each site-overlay is a fully functional overlay network and has its own set of Map Servers and Map Resolvers. Site-overlays share a border xTR with a transit area. Connectivity between site-overlays is provided via the transit area which we will refer to as "The Uberlay". This specification describes the Control Plane and Forwarding procedures for the implementation of an Uberlay connected multi-overlay LISP network. This approach to the structure of a LISP network may also enable regional failure survivability and fault isolation.

2. Definition of Terms

LISP related terms, notably Map-Request, Map-Reply, Ingress Tunnel Router (ITR), Egress Tunnel Router (ETR), Map-Server (MS) and Map-Resolver (MR) are defined in the LISP specification [RFC6830].

Terms defining interactions with the LISP Mapping System are defined in [RFC6833].

Terms related to the procedures for signal free multicast are defined in [RFC8378].

The following terms are here defined to facilitate the descriptions and discussions within this particular document.
Site-Overlay - Overlay network at a specific area or domain. This overlay network has a dedicated Mapping System.

Border-xTR - xTR that connects a site-overlay to one or more uberlays.

xTR - LISP Tunnel Router as defined in [RFC6833]. An xTR connects end-points to the site-overlay.

Local Mapping System - Mapping system of the site-overlay

Overlay - Overlay network that interconnects different site-overlays to each other. The Overlay has a dedicated Mapping System and creates an overlay amongst the border xTRs which connect different site-overlays.

Overlay Mapping System - Autonomous mapping system dedicated to the overlay.

Site-Overlay EIDs - Also referred to as local site-overlay EIDs, these are the EIDs that are connected to xTRs in a particular site-overlay and are registered in their own local site-overlay mapping system. These EIDs will also be registered in the overlay but not in the remote site-overlay mapping systems.

Remote site-overlay EIDs - These are EIDs connected and registered in site-overlays other than the local site-overlay.

Local site-overlay EIDs - These are EIDs connected and registered in the local site-overlay.

3. Interconnecting multiple LISP site-overlays via the Overlay

A LISP network can be structured as a collection of LISP site-overlays that are interconnected by one or more LISP Uberlays.

A LISP site-overlay is an overlay network that has its own set of xTRs, its own dedicated Mapping System and it may have a dedicated RLOC space, separate from that of other site-overlays or the overlay. A LISP overlay is also an overlay network with its own set of xTRs, its own dedicated Mapping System and it may have its own dedicated RLOC space. When the RLOC spaces are dedicated, RLOC routes in the local underlay do not leak across to the underlay of other site-overlays.

A site-overlay will have xTRs and Border xTRs. The xTRs provide connectivity to the local site-overlay EIDs, which are the EIDs that are locally connected to the overlay-site. The Border xTRs are Re-
encapsulating Tunnel Routers (RTRs) that connect the site-overlays to the LISP Uberlay in the transit network. xTRs participate in one site-overlay and one site-overlay only. Border xTRs participate in the mapping system of the site-overlay it resides in and the mapping system of the uberlay it connects the site-overlay to. Border xTRs may be shared by more than one site-overlay.

The different site-overlays can be interconnected by an uberlay. The uberlay consists of a dedicated Mapping System and the set of Border xTRs that connect the participating site-overlays to the Uberlay and the Uberlay Mapping System.

Each site-overlay will have its own set of Map Servers and Map Resolvers (MS/MRs) which operate as an autonomous Mapping System. The Uberlay Mapping System is also autonomous and includes all necessary Map Servers and Map Resolvers. Any of the Mapping Systems, in site-overlays or in the Uberlay, follow the control plane specification in [RFC6833] and may be structured as a Distributed Delegation Tree (DDT) per [RFC8111] for the purposes of horizontal scaling or other optimizations within each Mapping System.

The MS/MRs can be co-located with the border-xTRs of the site-overlay. When a Border xTR services more than one site-overlay, and the MS/MRs are instantiated on the Border xTR, logical instances of MS/MRs must be dedicated to each site-overlay.

This specification defines the interaction between the Mapping Systems of the site-overlays and the uberlay to deliver a multi-overlay hierarchical network. The forwarding procedures relevant to the border xTRs are also specified. Figure 1 illustrates the multi-overlay network.
Figure 1. Site-overlays connected via Uberlay

Structuring the LISP network as multiple site-overlays interconnected by an ubary delivers the following benefits:

- Enable the interworking of diverse site-overlay implementations in which different mapping systems and encapsulations may be used.

- Enhanced resiliency through regional failure survivability. Failures in one site-overlay or failures in a portion of the underlay should not affect other site-overlays.

- Reduce the state of the site-overlay control plane. The site-overlay control plane will only maintain state for EIDs that are connected to xTRs within the site-overlay. These EIDs are referred to as local site-overlay EIDs in this specification. Remote site-overlay EIDs will not be explicitly registered within the site-overlay.

- Separate the RLOC space of the different site-overlays as well as the overlay RLOC space. Each site-overlay will only need reachability to its own RLOCs, making the RLOCs private to the site-overlay. Similarly, the overlay RLOC space does not require knowledge of site-overlay specific RLOCs. This simplifies the underlay routing protocol structure and reduces the state that must be handled and maintained by the underlay routing protocols.

- Reduced latency for local site-overlay EID registrations may be achieved when xTRs and Map Servers are topologically close. Topological proximity is expected when the RLOC spaces for the different overlays are kept separate.

- Reduced latency for local site-overlay EID lookups may be achieved when xTRs, Map Resolvers and Map Servers are topologically close. Topological proximity is expected when the RLOC spaces for the different overlays are kept separate.

- Creates a multicast replication hierarchy where the Border RTRs serve as the points of multicast replication for multicast traffic that spans multiple site-overlays.

- Creates a distributed structure of RTRs that can be leveraged for the deployment of NAT traversal in the RLOC space.

4. General Procedures

A site-overlay maintains state only for its local site-overlay EIDs and RLOCs. Tunnels never cross site-overlay or overlay boundaries. Remote site-overlay EIDs are reachable at the source site-overlay via a default mapping which will steer all traffic destined to remote site-overlay EIDs to the border xTRs where it can be handed off to the overlay. The overlay maintains state for the EIDs of all interconnected site-overlays and will steer traffic from the source site-overlay to the destination site-overlay by encapsulating the traffic from the source site-overlay border xTR to the destination site-overlay border xTR. Thus, forwarding is achieved by
concatenating overlays and doing Re-encapsulation at the border xTRs to forward the traffic from the Ingress site-overlay to the Egress site-overlay via the Uberlay.

Inter-site communication is achieved by encapsulating traffic destined to remote site-overlay EIDs to the border xTRs following the mapping registered for the default EID-prefix, rather than having to maintain state for remote site-overlay EIDs. Traffic will be decapsulated at the border xTRs and a lookup in the uberlay mapping system will determine the site-overlay to which traffic is to be re-encapsulated. The lookup should return the uberlay RLOCs for the border xTRs of the site-overlay where the destination EID is located. At the border xTR of the destination site, traffic will be decapsulated, a lookup in the local destination site-overlay Mapping System will take place and traffic will be re-encapsulated to the xTR that connects to the destination EID.

Traffic for non-LISP sites, or for EIDs not registered in any site-overlay, will also be forwarded to the border xTR where it will be forwarded or dropped as appropriate.

4.1. Control Plane Procedures

Local EIDs must be registered by the xTRs into the local Mapping System of the site-overlay. Intra-site communication follows the standard procedures of registration, resolution, caching and encapsulation defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] and [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] amongst the xTRs within the local site-overlay.

The border xTRs at a site-overlay should have a local site-overlay RLOC-set and will also have an uberlay RLOC-set. The local site-overlay RLOC-set is in the private site-overlay RLOC space and is used by the border xTRs as the RLOC set for any mappings it may register with the site-overlay Mapping System. The uberlay RLOC-set for the border-xTRs of a particular site-overlay are the RLOCs to reach the site-overlay in the uberlay RLOC space. The border xTR will use the uberlay RLOC-set in any mappings it may register with the uberlay Mapping System. It is possible for a deployment to connect the RLOC spaces of the site-overlays and the uberlay, it is also possible in the scenario of a common RLOC space for the uberlay and local site-overlay RLOC sets to be one and the same. Any implementation of this specification should support disjoint RLOC spaces or joint RLOC spaces.

The border xTRs must register a default EID-prefix as specified in Section 4.3 with the local site-overlay Mapping System. Remote EIDs will be generally reachable by xTRs in a site-overlay using the
default EID mapping registered by the border xTRs. This is expected to be the mapping used for most communications to remote site-overlay EIDs. Remote site-overlay EIDs may be registered with the local site-overlay Mapping System for the purposes of supporting inter-overlay EID mobility as specified in Section 6, these mappings will be preferred over the default EID mapping whenever present.

Local EIDs registered with the site-overlay mapping system must also be registered with the Uberlay Mapping System. The registration of the local site-overlay EIDs with the uberlay Mapping System is originated by the Border xTRs. The local site-overlay EIDs SHOULD be aggregated into the shortest covering prefix possible before being registered with the uberlay Mapping System. How this aggregation is achieved is implementation specific.

In order to be able to register the local site-overlay EIDs with the uberlay Mapping System, the border xTRs must subscribe to all EIDs registered in their local site-overlay Mapping System. This is a subscription to 0.0.0.0/0 (or 0::/0) with the N-bit set as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-pubsub]. The subscription populates all local site-overlay EID mappings in the map-cache of the border xTRs.

Once received through the subscription, the local site-overlay EIDs in the map-cache at the border xTRs must be registered by the border xTRs with the uberlay Mapping System. The local site-overlay EIDs will be registered using the ‘uberlay’ RLOC-set for the registering border xTR.

Following [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility], the border xTRs will also subscribe to any EID prefixes it registers with the uberlay Mapping System. This allows the border xTRs to get Map Notify messages from the uberlay Mapping System for EID prefixes that may move from their local site-overlay to a remote site-overlay.

### 4.1.1. Split-horizon at the Border xTRs

Remote site-overlay EIDs may be learnt at a border xTR due to resolution of a remote destination EID or due to a mobility event as specified in Section 6. Remote site-overlay EIDs learnt from the uberlay will be installed in the map-cache of the border xTR with the corresponding remote uberlay RLOC-set for the remote border xTR. When these remote site-overlay EIDs are learnt as a consequence of the map-notify messages defined in the Inter-overlay mobility procedures in Section 6, the EIDs will also be registered with the local site-overlay mapping system using the local site-overlay RLOC-set for the border-xTR. The remote site-overlay EIDs registered with the local site-overlay mapping system will be learnt back at the border xTR because of the border xTR’s subscription to all local
site-overlay EIDs. This can cause the mapping for the remote EID that is installed in the border xTR map-cache to flip flop between the overlay RLOC-set and the local site-overlay RLOC-set.

In order to avoid this flip flopping a split horizon procedure must be implemented. When a mapping received at the border xTR (as part of its subscription to all local site-overlay EID prefixes) has the local site-overlay RLOC-set for the border xTR, the mapping received in the subscription corresponds to a remote site-overlay EID and should be ignored by the border xTR. The mapping should not be installed in the map-cache of the border xTR and the EIDs in the mapping should not be advertised to the overlay. More robust split horizon mechanisms can be proposed in future revisions of this specification.

4.2. Resolution and Forwarding Procedures

Intra-site communication follows the standard procedures of registration, resolution, caching and encapsulation defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] and [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] amongst the xTRs within the local site-overlay.

Inter-site communication is achieved by encapsulating traffic destined to remote site-overlay EIDs from the xTRs to the border xTRs. Traffic will be decapsulated at the border xTRs and a lookup in the overlay mapping system will determine the site-overlay to which traffic is to be re-encapsulated. The lookup should return the overlay RLOCs for the border xTRs of the site-overlay where the destination EID is located. At the border xTR of the destination overlay-site, traffic will be de-capsulated, and re-encapsulated to the destination xTR, just like an RTR does. The border xTR already has the destination EID in its cache per its subscription to all local site-overlay EIDs.

When receiving encapsulated traffic, a border xTR will de-capsulate the traffic and will do a lookup for the destination EID in its map cache. If the destination EID is present in the map cache, the traffic is forwarded and no lookup takes place. If the destination EID is not present in the cache, the destination EID is not in any local site-overlay connected to the border xTR, in which case the border xTR will issue a map-request to all Uberlay Mapping Systems it is connected to. The criteria to determine which Mapping Systems are Uberlay Mapping Systems is simply to select those Mapping Systems with which the border xTR doesn’t hold a subscription to 0.0.0.0/0 (or 0::/0).
4.2.1. Multi-overlay requests at border xTR

Border xTRs may query all Mapping Systems in all overlays it participates in. The border xTR will then choose based on longest prefix match the more specific EID mapping provided by any of the Mapping Systems. This procedure could also include site-overlay Mapping Systems, however those are not expected to be queried as the border xTR subscribes to all EIDs in the site-overlays and the presence of the mappings in the cache will prevent any lookups. The processing of Map Requests following the multi-domain request logic works as follows:

1. The Border xTR sends a map request for the prefix that it intends to resolve to each of the Mapping Systems it participates in.

2. The Border xTR receives Map Replies from each of the different Mapping Systems it sent requests to. The Border xTR will treat the replies differently depending on their contents:

   * Negative Map Replies are ignored and discarded unless all Map Replies are Negative, then the border xTR follows the procedures specified in [RFC6833] for Negative Map Replies.

   * Map Replies with RLOCs that belong to the requesting border xTR are ignored.

   * Map Replies with EID prefixes that are not already in the map cache of the border xTR are accepted and cached.

   * If the prefix already exists in the cache/routing table and the source of the prefix is another reply from the multi-domain request, the RLOCs received in the mapping are added to the RLOC set cached for the prefix.

When following these rules when processing multi-domain requests, the Border xTR guarantees proper discovery and use of destination prefixes, that will be associated with their corresponding overlay fabric. By ignoring the negative replies the procedure works regardless of whether the Mapping Systems of multiple fabrics have consistent configurations or operate individually without being aware of the whole addressing space in the overlay fabric.

4.3. Default EID registration and treatment

Border xTRs will register a mapping to be used as a default mapping to handle the forwarding of traffic destined to any EIDs that are not explicitly registered. These mappings will be registered in the local site-overlay Mapping System of each site-overlay. The RLOCs
for the mappings will be the site-overlay RLOCs of the border xTR. This registration is intended to instruct the Mapping System to follow the procedures in [RFC6833] for Negative Map Replies and calculate the broadest non-registered EID prefix that includes the requested destination EID and issue a map-reply with the calculated EID and the RLOCs registered by the border xTRs. The map-reply may have a shorter TTL to accommodate any changes in the registrations.

The instruction to the Mapping System can be encoded as the registration of a 0.0.0.0/0 (or 0::/0) EID or it can be encoded as the registration of an agreed upon distinguished name such as "Default". In either case, the registration will contain the RLOC set desired for the default handling.

5. Multicast Specific Procedures

This specification will focus on the procedures necessary to extend signal-free multicast [RFC8378] across multiple site-overlays interconnected with an uberlay. The specification will focus on the extensions of the Sender and Receiver site procedures

5.1. Inter-site-overlay Control Plane Procedures for Signal-free multicast

1. At the listener sites, xTRs with multicast listeners will follow the receiver site procedures described in [RFC8378]. A replication list will be built and registered on the site-overlay Mapping System for the multicast channel being joined by the listeners.

2. The Mapping System for the listener site-overlay will send Map-Notify messages towards the multicast source or RP per [RFC8378]. The multicast source or RP is reachable via the border-xTRs of the listener site-overlay via the default EID mapping registered in the listener site-overlay.

3. Upon reception of the Map-Notify in the previous step, the listener site-overlay border-xTR will register the multicast EID with the uberlay Mapping System using the uberlay RLOCs for its site-overlay as the RLOC set for the mapping being registered. Only one of the RLOCs in the set should be active in the registration per the procedures in [RFC8378]. A replication tree is built in the uberlay as specified in [RFC8378].

4. After the listener site-overlay border-xTR registers the multicast EID with the uberlay Mapping system, the uberlay MS will send a Map-Notify toward the multicast source per [RFC8378]
5. Upon reception of the Map-Notify in the previous step, the border xTR at the source site-overlay registers its interest in the multicast EID with the source site-overlay Mapping System following the procedures described in [RFC8378].

5.2. Border xTR Resolution and Forwarding procedures for Signal-free multicast

The mapping resolution procedures for multicast EIDs at border xTRs fall within the scope of the mechanisms specified in Section 4. The Map-replies obtained from the lookup will follow the behavior specified in [RFC8378] for signal-free multicast.

Forwarding will also follow the General Procedures specified in Section 4 without alteration. It is worth noting that the concatenation of overlays between listener sites, uberlay and sender site-overlays creates a convenient replication structure where the border xTRs act as the replication points to form an optimized end-to-end multi-level replication tree [Ref to Replication Engineering draft].

6. Inter site-overlay Mobility Procedures

The receiver and sender site procedures defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] apply without change to each site-overlay and to the uberlay. Border xTRs are connected to two or more overlay networks which are following the mobility procedures. An away table is defined at the border xTR for each overlay network it participates in. In order to illustrate the procedures required, this specification describes a scenario where a border xTR has one local site-overlay away table and one uberlay facing away table. The procedures for mobility described in this section are extensible to border xTRs participating in more than two overlays.

When a map notify for an EID is received at an xTR, an away entry is created on the receiving side table. Any away entries for the specific EID in other tables on the same LISP node (xTR or RTR) must be removed. This general rule addresses convergence necessary for a first move as well as any subsequent moves (moves that take place after the away tables are already populated with entries for the moving EID due to previous moves).

The following set of procedures highlights any additions to the mobility procedures defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility]:

1. Detect the roaming EID per the mechanisms described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] and register the EID with the site-overlay Mapping System at the landing site-overlay
2. The site-overlay Mapping System at the landing site-overlay must send a Map-Notify to the last registrant xTR (if it is local to the site-overlay) and to the border xTR as the border xTR subscribes to all EIDs in the site-overlay.

3. The border xTR will install an entry for the moved host in the local away table of the border xTR.

4. The border xTR from the landing site-overlay will register the roaming EID with the overlay Mapping System using the overlay RLOC-set for the landing site-overlay.

5. The Uberlay Map Server will send Map-Notify messages to the border xTRs at the departure site-overlay as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] (border xTR with the previously registered RLOCs).

6. Upon reception of the Map-Notify, the border xTR must check if the Map-Notify is for an EID-prefix that is covered by a broader or equal EID-prefix that is locally registered. Local registration is determined by the presence of the broader or equal EID prefix in the map-cache of the border xTR.

7. If the roaming EID-prefix received in the Map-Notify is not covered under a previously registered EID-prefix in the local site-overlay, the EID-prefix is a newly registered prefix and no further action is required.

8. If the roaming EID-prefix received in the Map-Notify is covered under a registered EID-prefix, the Map-Notify is due to a move event. In this case, the site-overlay border xTR must register the roaming EID prefix in the site-overlay mapping system using the site-overlay facing RLOC-set of the border-xTRs. The roaming EID-prefix must also be installed in the overlay facing away table of the border xTR at the departure site-overlay.

9. The departure site-overlay Map-Server will send Map-Notify messages to the xTRs at the departure site-overlay as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] (edge xTRs with the previously registered RLOCs).

10. When the site-overlay xTR at the departure site-overlay receives the Map-Notify from the border xTR, it will include the EID prefix received in the Map-Notify in its away table per the procedures described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility].

11. Data triggered Solicit Map Requests (SMRs) will be initiated in the different site-overlays and the overlay as traffic matches.
the different away tables. As specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility], these SMRs notify the different ITRs involved in communications with the roaming EID that they must issue a new Map-Request to the mapping system to renew their mappings for the roaming EID.

7. Virtual Private Network (VPN) Considerations

When supporting multiple Instance IDs as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-vpn] the Instance IDs range is divided in two sets. A reuse-set that can be used in each site-overlay and a global-set used across site-overlays and the uberlay.

Instance-IDs that are local to a site-overlay should only provide intra-overlay connectivity and are in the site-overlay mapping system only for VPN use for the xTRs in the site-overlay. When the VPN reaches across site-overlays, then the global-set instance-IDs are in the uberlay mapping system as well as each site-overlay mapping system where the VPN members exist.

8. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA implications
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1. Introduction

The main motivation for this specification is to provide a methodology for the interconnection of LISP domains that may use disparate control and/or data plane approaches. For instance, one domain may use native LISP encapsulation for its data plane and a DDT based mapping system, while another domain may use VXLAN-GPE encapsulation and a mapping system based on [I-D.farinacci-lisp-decent]. Furthermore, one domain may use an IPv4 RLOC space and the other domain may use an IPv6 RLOC space and there may not be connectivity between the domains at the RLOC level. We propose a method to interconnect and enable interoperability between these disparate LISP overlay networks by connecting them to a common transit LISP overlay.

In order to provide interworking across implementations of overlays that may use different control and data plane approaches, a LISP network may be structured as a collection of site-overlays interconnected by a transit area. Each site-overlay is a fully functional overlay network and has its own set of Map Servers and Map Resolvers. Site-overlays share a border xTR with a transit area. Connectivity between site-overlays is provided via the transit area which we will refer to as "The Uberlay". This specification describes the Control Plane and Forwarding procedures for the implementation of an Uberlay connected multi-overlay LISP network. This approach to the structure of a LISP network may also enable regional failure survivability and fault isolation.

2. Definition of Terms

LISP related terms, notably Map-Request, Map-Reply, Ingress Tunnel Router (ITR), Egress Tunnel Router (ETR), Map-Server (MS) and Map-Resolver (MR) are defined in the LISP specification [RFC6830].

Terms defining interactions with the LISP Mapping System are defined in [RFC6833].

Terms related to the procedures for signal free multicast are defined in [RFC8378].

The following terms are here defined to facilitate the descriptions and discussions within this particular document.
Site-Overlay - Overlay network at a specific area or domain. This overlay network has a dedicated Mapping System.

Border-xTR - xTR that connects a site-overlay to one or more overlays.

xTR - LISP Tunnel Router as defined in [RFC6833]. An xTR connects end-points to the site-overlay.

Local Mapping System - Mapping system of the site-overlay

Overlay - Overlay network that interconnects different site-overlays to each other. The Overlay has a dedicated Mapping System and creates an overlay amongst the border xTRs which connect different site-overlays.

Overlay Mapping System - Autonomous mapping system dedicated to the overlay.

Site-Overlay EIDs - Also referred to as local site-overlay EIDs, these are the EIDs that are connected to xTRs in a particular site-overlay and are registered in their own local site-overlay mapping system. These EIDs will also be registered in the overlay but not in the remote site-overlay mapping systems.

Remote site-overlay EIDs - These are EIDs connected and registered in site-overlays other than the local site-overlay.

Local site-overlay EIDs - These are EIDs connected and registered in the local site-overlay.

3. Interconnecting multiple LISP site-overlays via the Uberlay

A LISP network can be structured as a collection of LISP site-overlays that are interconnected by one or more LISP Uberlays.

A LISP site-overlay is an overlay network that has its own set of xTRs, its own dedicated Mapping System and it may have a dedicated RLOC space, separate from that of other site-overlays or the overlay. A LISP overlay is also an overlay network with its own set of xTRs, its own dedicated Mapping System and it may have its own dedicated RLOC space. When the RLOC spaces are dedicated, RLOC routes in the local underlay do not leak across to the underlay of other site-overlays.

A site-overlay will have xTRs and Border xTRs. The xTRs provide connectivity to the local site-overlay EIDs, which are the EIDs that are locally connected to the overlay-site. The Border xTRs are Re-
encapsulating Tunnel Routers (RTRs) that connect the site-overlays to the LISP Uberlay in the transit network. xTRs participate in one site-overlay and one site-overlay only. Border xTRs participate in the mapping system of the site-overlay it resides in and the mapping system of the uberlay it connects the site-overlay to. Border xTRs may be shared by more than one site-overlay.

The different site-overlays can be interconnected by an uberlay. The uberlay consists of a dedicated Mapping System and the set of Border xTRs that connect the participating site-overlays to the Uberlay and the Uberlay Mapping System.

Each site-overlay will have its own set of Map Servers and Map Resolvers (MS/MRs) which operate as an autonomous Mapping System. The Uberlay Mapping System is also autonomous and includes all necessary Map Servers and Map Resolvers. Any of the Mapping Systems, in site-overlays or in the Uberlay, follow the control plane specification in [RFC6833] and may be structured as a Distributed Delegation Tree (DDT) per [RFC8111] for the purposes of horizontal scaling or other optimizations within each Mapping System.

The MS/MRs can be co-located with the border-xTRs of the site-overlay. When a Border xTR services more than one site-overlay, and the MS/MRs are instantiated on the Border xTR, logical instances of MS/MRs must be dedicated to each site-overlay.

This specification defines the interaction between the Mapping Systems of the site-overlays and the uberlay to deliver a multi-overlay hierarchical network. The forwarding procedures relevant to the border xTRs are also specified. Figure 1 illustrates the multi-overlay network.
Figure 1. Site-overlays connected via Uberlay

Structuring the LISP network as multiple site-overlays interconnected by an uberlay delivers the following benefits:

- Enable the interworking of diverse site-overlay implementations in which different mapping systems and encapsulations may be used.
o Enhanced resiliency through regional failure survivability. Failures in one site-overlay or failures in a portion of the underlay should not affect other site-overlays.

o Reduce the state of the site-overlay control plane. The site-overlay control plane will only maintain state for EIDs that are connected to xTRs within the site-overlay. These EIDs are referred to as local site-overlay EIDs in this specification. Remote site-overlay EIDs will not be explicitly registered within the site-overlay.

o Separate the RLOC space of the different site-overlays as well as the overlay RLOC space. Each site-overlay will only need reachability to its own RLOCs, making the RLOCs private to the site-overlay. Similarly, the overlay RLOC space does not require knowledge of site-overlay specific RLOCs. This simplifies the underlay routing protocol structure and reduces the state that must be handled and maintained by the underlay routing protocols.

o Reduced latency for local site-overlay EID registrations may be achieved when xTRs and Map Servers are topologically close. Topological proximity is expected when the RLOC spaces for the different overlays are kept separate.

o Reduced latency for local site-overlay EID lookups may be achieved when xTRs, Map Resolvers and Map Servers are topologically close. Topological proximity is expected when the RLOC spaces for the different overlays are kept separate.

o Creates a multicast replication hierarchy where the Border RTRs serve as the points of multicast replication for multicast traffic that spans multiple site-overlays.

o Creates a distributed structure of RTRs that can be leveraged for the deployment of NAT traversal in the RLOC space.

3.1. Logical Topology Considerations

xTRs as defined in RFC6833bis connect a network to the LISP overlay and register the EID prefixes from the connected network to the LISP mapping system. Border xTRs, as defined in this document, will connect site-overlays to the Overlay and register the EID prefixes that originate in a site-overlay in the Mapping System of the Overlay. Conversely, a border xTR may register EID prefixes present in the Overlay Mapping System into the Mapping System of a particular site-overlay. Furthermore, border xTRs may connect Overlays to each
other and register the EID prefixes from one Overlay into the other. There is no provision for the detection of registration loops when concatenating site-overlays and Overlays, thus any interconnection of overlay domains (site-overlays or Overlays) must be done in a loop free topology.

A loop free topology is hereby defined for reference. This is a general concept and is not encoded into any of the protocol messages in LISP. A loop free topology limits the peerings between Overlays and/or overlays to a strict hierarchy. At the top of the hierarchy is a single central Overlay or Core Overlay. The loop free topology is defined by two simple rules: Overlays must only connect to Overlays in the next consecutive level of hierarchy (no level skipping) and overlays within the same level of hierarchy must not connect to each other. The loop-free topology hierarchy is illustrated in Figure 2.
4. General Procedures

A site-overlay maintains state only for its local site-overlay EIDs and RLOCs. Tunnels never cross site-overlay or overlay boundaries. Remote site-overlay EIDs are reachable at the source site-overlay via a default mapping which will steer all traffic destined to remote site-overlay EIDs to the border xTRs where it can be handed off to the overlay. Traffic will be decapsulated at the border xTRs and a lookup in the overlay mapping system will determine the site-overlay to which traffic is to be re-encapsulated. The overlay maintains state for the EIDs of all interconnected site-overlays and will steer traffic from the source site-overlay to the destination site-overlay by encapsulating the traffic from the source site-overlay border xTR.
to the destination site-overlay border xTR. At the border xTR of the destination site-overlay, traffic will be de-capsulated, a lookup in the local destination site-overlay Mapping System will take place and traffic will be re-encapsulated to the xTR that connects to the destination EID. Thus, forwarding is achieved by concatenating overlays and doing Re-encapsulation at the border xTRs to forward the traffic from the Ingress site-overlay to the Egress site-overlay via the Uberlay.

Traffic for non-LISP sites, or for EIDs not registered in any site-overlay, will also be forwarded to the border xTR where it will be forwarded or dropped as appropriate.

4.1. Control Plane Procedures

Local EIDs must be registered by the xTRs into the local Mapping System of the site-overlay. Intra-site communication follows the standard procedures of registration, resolution, caching and encapsulation defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] and [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] amongst the xTRs within the local site-overlay.

The border xTRs at a site-overlay should have a local site-overlay RLOC-set and will also have an uberlay RLOC-set. The local site-overlay RLOC-set is in the private site-overlay RLOC space and is used by the border xTRs as the RLOC set for any mappings it may register with the site-overlay Mapping System. The uberlay RLOC-set for the border xTRs of a particular site-overlay are the RLOCs to reach the site-overlay in the uberlay RLOC space. The border xTR will use the uberlay RLOC-set in any mappings it may register with the uberlay Mapping System. It is possible for a deployment to connect the RLOC spaces of the site-overlays and the uberlay, it is also possible in the scenario of a common RLOC space for the uberlay and local site-overlay RLOC sets to be one and the same. Any implementation of this specification should support disjoint RLOC spaces or joint RLOC spaces.

The border xTRs must register a default EID-prefix as specified in Section 4.3 with the local site-overlay Mapping System. Remote EIDs will be generally reachable by xTRs in a site-overlay using the default EID mapping registered by the border xTRs. This is expected to be the mapping used for most communications to remote site-overlay EIDs. Remote site-overlay EIDs may be registered with the local site-overlay Mapping System for the purposes of supporting inter-overlay EID mobility as specified in Section 6, these mappings will be preferred over the default EID mapping whenever present.
Local EIDs registered with the site-overlay mapping system must also be registered with the Uberlay Mapping System. The registration of the local site-overlay EIDs with the overlay Mapping System is originated by the Border xTRs. The local site-overlay EIDs SHOULD be aggregated into the shortest covering prefix possible before being registered with the overlay Mapping System. How this aggregation is achieved is implementation specific.

In order to be able to register the local site-overlay EIDs with the overlay Mapping System, the border xTRs must subscribe to all EIDs registered in their local site-overlay Mapping System. This is a subscription to 0.0.0.0/0 (or 0::/0) with the N-bit set as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-pubsub]. The subscription populates all local site-overlay EID mappings in the map-cache of the border xTRs.

Once received through the subscription, the local site-overlay EIDs in the map-cache at the border xTRs must be registered by the border xTRs with the overlay Mapping System. The local site-overlay EIDs will be registered using the 'uberlay' RLOC-set for the registering border xTR.

Following [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility], the border xTRs will also subscribe to any EID prefixes it registers with the overlay Mapping System. This allows the border xTRs to get Map Notify messages from the overlay Mapping System for EID prefixes that may move from their local site-overlay to a remote site-overlay.

4.1.1. Split-horizon at the Border xTRs

Remote site-overlay EIDs may be learnt at a border xTR due to resolution of a remote destination EID or due to a mobility event as specified in Section 6. Remote site-overlay EIDs learnt from the overlay will be installed in the map-cache of the border xTR with the corresponding remote overlay RLOC-set for the remote border xTR. When these remote site-overlay EIDs are learnt as a consequence of the map-notify messages defined in the Inter-overlay mobility procedures in Section 6, the EIDs will also be registered with the local site-overlay mapping system using the local site-overlay RLOC-set for the border-xTR. The remote site-overlay EIDs registered with the local site-overlay mapping system will be learnt back at the border xTR because of the border xTR’s subscription to all local site-overlay EIDs. This can cause the mapping for the remote EID that is installed in the border xTR map-cache to flip flop between the overlay RLOC-set and the local site-overlay RLOC-set.

In order to avoid this flip flopping a split horizon procedure must be implemented. When a mapping received at the border xTR (as part of its subscription to all local site-overlay EID prefixes) has the
local site-overlay RLOC-set for the border xTR, the mapping received in the subscription corresponds to a remote site-overlay EID and should be ignored by the border xTR. The mapping should not be installed in the map-cache of the border xTR and the EIDs in the mapping should not be advertised to the uberlay. More robust split horizon mechanisms can be proposed in future revisions of this specification.

4.1.2. Border-xTR Resiliency

Redundancy at the border xTRs requires that border xTRs be logically grouped so that the redundant array doesn’t create a registration loop. As border xTRs interconnect overlay domains, the border xTRs will register the EID prefixes from one domain into the neighboring domain. From the perspective of the border xTR, the EID prefixes to be registered in one domain are learnt from a neighbor domain which we will refer to as the "site-of-origin". The site-of-origin may be an overlay-site, an Uberlay or an IP network.

Border xTRs should be logically grouped in Border Sets. A border set is a group of border xTRs that register EID prefixes from the same site-of-origin. Members of a border set will register the EIDs from a particular site-of-origin into the neighboring overlay (site-overlay or uberlay) using a common site-id. The use of the site-ID namespace is locally significant to each overlay domain (site-overlay or Uberlay) and does not require cross-domain synchronization or dispersion. A border-xTR may be a member of multiple border sets to allow different site-of-origin domains to be serviced by the border-xTR. Note that not all site-of-origin domains will connect to the same combination of border-xTRs.

EID Mappings will be tagged with a site-ID according to their site-of-origin when they are registered by the border-xTR. The site-ID must be maintained in the Mapping System as part of the registration record. EID Mappings published and received at the border xTR must include the site-ID for the EID Mapping. If the border-xTR receives a mapping for an EID with a site-ID that matches the site-ID for one of its border sets (site-of-origin), the Border xTR will not register that information to the site-of-origin associated with that site-ID and thus prevent any registration loops from occurring.

4.2. Resolution and Forwarding Procedures

Intra-site communication follows the standard procedures of registration, resolution, caching and encapsulation defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis] and [I-D.ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis] amongst the xTRs within the local site-overlay.
Inter-site communication is achieved by encapsulating traffic destined to remote site-overlay EIDs from the xTRs to the border xTRs. Traffic will be decapsulated at the border xTRs and a lookup in the overlay mapping system will determine the site-overlay to which traffic is to be re-encapsulated. The lookup should return the overlay RLOCs for the border xTRs of the site-overlay where the destination EID is located. At the border xTR of the destination overlay-site, traffic will be de-capsulated, and re-encapsulated to the destination xTR, just like an RTR does. The border xTR already has the destination EID in its cache per its subscription to all local site-overlay EIDs.

When receiving encapsulated traffic, a border xTR will de-capsulate the traffic and will do a lookup for the destination EID in its map cache. If the destination EID is present in the map cache, the traffic is forwarded and no lookup takes place. If the destination EID is not present in the cache, the destination EID is not in any local site-overlay connected to the border xTR, in which case the border xTR will issue a map-request to all Uberlay Mapping Systems it is connected to. The criteria to determine which Mapping Systems are Uberlay Mapping Systems is simply to select those Mapping Systems with which the border xTR doesn’t hold a subscription to 0.0.0.0/0 (or 0::/0).

4.2.1. Multi-overlay requests at border xTR

A Border xTR may query all Mapping Systems in all overlays it participates in. The border xTR will then chose based on longest prefix match the more specific EID mapping provided by any of the Mapping Systems. This procedure could also include site-overlay Mapping Systems, however those are not expected to be queried as the border xTR subscribes to all EIDs in the site-overlays and the presence of the mappings in the cache will prevent any lookups. The processing of Map Requests following the multi-domain request logic works as follows:

1. The Border xTR sends a map request for the prefix that it intends to resolve to each of the overlay Mapping Systems it participates in.

2. The Border xTR receives Map Replies from each of the different overlay Mapping Systems it sent requests to. The Border xTR will treat the replies differently depending on their contents:

* Negative Map Replies (NMR) are ignored and discarded unless all Map Replies received are Negative, then the border xTR follows the procedures specified in [RFC6833] for Negative Map Replies.
* Map Replies with RLOCs that belong to the requesting border xTR are ignored.

* Map Replies with EID prefixes that are not already in the map cache of the border xTR are accepted and cached.

* If the EID prefix received in the Map-Reply already exists in the cache/routing table, but the Map-Reply contains a different RLOC-set than the one cached, the mappings are merged so that the RLOCs received in the Map-Reply are added to the RLOC-set previously cached for the EID prefix.

* If the EID prefix received in the Map-Reply is more specific or less specific than an EID prefix already cached, the mapping received MUST be cached.

It is expected that a deployment of the uberlay would include the dynamic registration of default EIDs. It is also recommended that an implementation adopts mechanisms for the dynamic resolution of default EIDs. In an environment leveraging the dynamic registration and resolution of default EIDs, the border xTR should not receive Negative Map-Replies, but all replies (including those in response to requests for destinations that are external to the EID space) will be Map-replies with a non-zero locator count. Nevertheless, an implementation could opt to not use dynamic default-EID handling. In these cases, the border xTR will receive NMRs. The implementation of the Border xTR should defer the decision on caching an NMR until all relevant Map-replies are received. To this effect, the implementation should implement mechanisms to ensure that sufficient replies are received before programming the map-cache. The mechanisms by which this is achieved are an implementation specific matter and therefore not specified in this document.

When following these rules to process multi-domain requests, the Border xTR guarantees proper discovery and use of destination prefixes that will be associated with their corresponding overlay-site. By ignoring the negative replies the procedure works regardless of whether the Mapping Systems of multiple uberlays have consistent configurations or operate individually without being aware of the whole addressing space in the overlay fabric.

4.3. Default EID registration and treatment

Border xTRs will register a mapping to be used as a default mapping to handle the forwarding of traffic destined to any EIDs that are not explicitly registered. These mappings will be registered in the local site-overlay Mapping System of each site-overlay. The RLOCs for the mappings will be the site-overlay RLOCs of the border xTR.
This registration is intended to instruct the Mapping System to follow the procedures in [RFC6833] for Negative Map Replies and calculate the broadest non-registered EID prefix that includes the requested destination EID and issue a map-reply with the calculated EID and the RLOCs registered by the border xTRs. The map-reply for this default mapping will have a shorter TTL to accommodate any changes in the registrations.

The instruction to the Mapping System can be encoded as the registration of an agreed upon distinguished name such as "Default". The registration will contain the RLOC set desired for the default handling.

5. Multicast Specific Procedures

This specification will focus on the procedures necessary to extend signal-free multicast [RFC8378] across multiple site-overlays interconnected with an uberlay. The specification will focus on the extensions of the Sender and Receiver site procedures.

5.1. Inter-site-overlay Control Plane Procedures for Signal-free multicast

1. At the listener sites, xTRs with multicast listeners will follow the receiver site procedures described in [RFC8378]. A replication list will be built and registered on the site-overlay Mapping System for the multicast channel being joined by the listeners.

2. The Mapping System for the listener site-overlay will send Map-Notify messages towards the multicast source or RP per [RFC8378]. The multicast source or RP is reachable via the border-xTRs of the listener site-overlay via the default EID mapping registered in the listener site-overlay.

3. Upon reception of the Map-Notify in the previous step, the listener site-overlay border-xTR will register the multicast EID with the uberlay Mapping System using the uberlay RLOCs for its site-overlay as the RLOC set for the mapping being registered. Only one of the RLOCs in the set should be active in the registration per the procedures in [RFC8378]. A replication tree is built in the uberlay as specified in [RFC8378].

4. After the listener site-overlay border-xTR registers the multicast EID with the uberlay Mapping system, the uberlay MS will send a Map-Notify toward the multicast source per [RFC8378]
5. Upon reception of the Map-Notify in the previous step, the border xTR at the source site-overlay registers its interest in the multicast EID with the source site-overlay Mapping System following the procedures described in [RFC8378].

5.2. Border xTR Resolution and Forwarding procedures for Signal-free multicast

The mapping resolution procedures for multicast EIDs at border xTRs fall within the scope of the mechanisms specified in Section 4. The Map-replies obtained from the lookup will follow the behavior specified in [RFC8378] for signal-free multicast.

Forwarding will also follow the General Procedures specified in Section 4 without alteration. It is worth noting that the concatenation of overlays between listener sites, uberlay and sender site-overlays creates a convenient replication structure where the border xTRs act as the replication points to form an optimized end-to-end multi-level replication tree.

6. Inter site-overlay Mobility Procedures

The receiver and sender site procedures defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] apply without change to each site-overlay and to the uberlay. Border xTRs are connected to two or more overlay networks which are following the mobility procedures. An away table is defined at the border xTR for each overlay network it participates in. In order to illustrate the procedures required, this specification describes a scenario where a border xTR has one local site-overlay away table and one uberlay facing away table. The procedures for mobility described in this section are extensible to border xTRs participating in more than two overlays.

When a map notify for an EID is received at an xTR, an away entry is created on the receiving side table. Any away entries for the specific EID in other tables on the same LISP node (xTR or RTR) must be removed. This general rule addresses convergence necessary for a first move as well as any subsequent moves (moves that take place after the away tables are already populated with entries for the moving EID due to previous moves).

The following set of procedures highlights any additions to the mobility procedures defined in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility]:

1. Detect the roaming EID per the mechanisms described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] and register the EID with the site-overlay Mapping System at the landing site-overlay
2. The site-overlay Mapping System at the landing site-overlay must send a Map-Notify to the last registrant xTR (if it is local to the site-overlay) and to the border xTR as the border xTR subscribes to all EIDs in the site-overlay.

3. The border xTR will install an entry for the moved host in the local away table of the border xTR.

4. The border xTR from the landing site-overlay will register the roaming EID with the uberlay Mapping System using the uberlay RLOC-set for the landing site-overlay.

5. The Uberlay Map Server will send Map-Notify messages to the border xTRs at the departure site-overlay as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] (border xTR with the previously registered RLOCs).

6. Upon reception of the Map-Notify, the border xTR must check if the Map-Notify is for an EID-prefix that is covered by a broader or equal EID-prefix that is locally registered. Local registration is determined by the presence of the broader or equal EID prefix in the map-cache of the border xTR.

7. If the roaming EID-prefix received in the Map-Notify is not covered under a previously registered EID-prefix in the local site-overlay, the EID-prefix is a newly registered prefix and no further action is required.

8. If the roaming EID-prefix received in the Map-Notify is covered under a registered EID-prefix, the Map-Notify is due to a move event. In this case, the site-overlay border xTR must register the roaming EID prefix in the site-overlay mapping system using the site-overlay facing RLOC-set of the border-xTRs. The roaming EID-prefix must also be installed in the uberlay facing away table of the border xTR at the departure site-overlay.

9. The departure site-overlay Map-Server will send Map-Notify messages to the xTRs at the departure site-overlay as specified in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility] (edge xTRs with the previously registered RLOCs).

10. When the site-overlay xTR at the departure site-overlay receives the Map-Notify from the border xTR, it will include the EID prefix received in the Map-Notify in its away table per the procedures described in [I-D.ietf-lisp-eid-mobility].

11. Data triggered Solicit Map Requests (SMRs) will be initiated in the different site-overlays and the uberlay as traffic matches...
the different away tables. As specified in
[I-D.ietf-lisp-eld-mobility], these SMRs notify the different
ITRs involved in communications with the roaming EID that they
must issue a new Map-Request to the mapping system to renew
their mappings for the roaming EID.

7. Virtual Private Network (VPN) Considerations

When supporting multiple Instance IDs as specified in
[I-D.ietf-lisp-vpn] the Instance IDs range is divided in two sets. A
reuse-set that can be used in each site-overlay and a global-set used
across site-overlays and the uberlay.

Instance-IDs that are local to a site-overlay should only provide
intra-overlay connectivity and are in the site-overlay mapping system
only for VPN use for the xTRs in the site-overlay. When the VPN
reaches across site-overlays, then the global-set instance-IDs are in
the uberlay mapping system as well as each site-overlay mapping
system where the VPN members exist.

8. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA implications
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