

draft-ginsberg-lsr-rfc8919bis-02

Les Ginsberg, Cisco
Peter Psenak , Cisco
Stefano Previdi, Huawei
Wim Henderickx, Nokia
John Drake, Juniper

draft-ppsenak-lsr-rfc8920bis-02

Peter Psenak, Cisco
Les Ginsberg, Cisco
Wim Henderickx, Nokia
Jeff Tantsura, Microsoft
Hannes Gredler, RTBrick
John Drake, Juniper

History

June 2021

Confusion regarding use of zero-length ABM advertisements

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/lsr/CwKa4S1MAX-y7niewjIV6PbLPzE/>

Errata proposed

May 2022

Errata rejected by John Scudder (AD)

“It would be more appropriate to pursue this as an update or bis RFC”

June 2022

rfc8919bis/rfc8920bis drafts published

Later revisions incorporated comments from Bruno/Shraddha

Changes of Significance

"S-bit: Set to specify Segment Routing Policy (**this is dataplane independent**)."

"When SABM or UDABM Length is non-zero and the L-flag is NOT set, all applications specified in the bit mask MUST use the link attribute advertisements in the sub-TLV."

"The end result of the set of rules defined above is that for a given application either the attribute values advertised in ASLA sub-sub-TLVs are used or the attribute values advertised in Legacy sub-TLVs are used, but not both."

"So long as there is any legacy router in the network that has any of the standard applications defined in this document enabled, all routers MUST continue to advertise link attributes for these applications using only legacy advertisements. ASLA advertisements for these applications MUST NOT be sent."

Next Steps

No substantive changes – only clarifications

Would like to fast track by:

- 1) Immediate call for WG adoption
- 2) Last call no later than IETF 115
- 3) Constrain the IESG review (thank you John)