

Update on 6830bis/6833bis documents

Albert Cabellos (acabello@ac.upc.edu)

IETF 109

November 2020

Since IETF - 106

- Posted draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis-36 (Yesterday)

- 3 revisions

[Discuss](#)

[Erik Kline](#)

([Mirja Kühlewind](#))

([Eric Rescorla](#))

- Posted draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis-30 (Yesterday)

- 2 revisions

[Discuss](#)

[Martin Duke](#)

([Mirja Kühlewind](#))

([Eric Rescorla](#))

draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6830bis-36

- Specified behavior when N and V bits are NOT set
- Described limitations of ICMP for PMTU discovery
- Clarify that Instance-ID is not protected, when carrying 802.11q tags on-path attackers can change them.
- Some minor editorial changes

draft-ietf-lisp-rfc6833bis-30

- Clarified used of pITR-bit in Map-Request
- Removed behaviour specifying “verifying Map-Request” with “piggybacked” data
- Elevated to MUST implement HMAC-SHA-256-128 and SHOULD implement HMAC-SHA-256-128+HKDF-SHA256
- Clarified that the Record Count value reply count can be larger than the requested count, for instance when more-specifics are present.
- Specified use of the ‘salt’ in the KDF mechanisms in Map-Register
- Specified that Map-Notify (as a response to Map-Register) and Map-Notify-ack are never retransmitted
 - Unsolicited Map-Notify can be retransmitted