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One Draft, One Homework

“Joe: we will look at this work, but perhaps we can push forward with a broader look at the registries.

Benoit: can you go through the IANA registry and have a look. If there is a just a few, then it might be simple, if there is lots then it might be a bigger job.

Based on that AI to call for adoption on list post 115” (from IETF#115 OPSWAG Minutes)
Proposed Plan After Reviewing The Registry

• Progress rfc7125-update separately as it updates an existing RFC

• Edit a second draft to “clean” other entries in the registry
  – This document is intended to include only *simple fixes* and which do not require updating existing RFCs
  – *New IEs, if needed, will be moved to a separate document*
  – Simple-ipfix-fixes *may or may not be published* as an RFC
Walking Through the Required Changes (1)

• rfc7125-update was adopted since then
  – Addressed the comments received during the CFA
  – Went with a bis rather than update
  – Ready for the WGLC

• Edited draft-boucla-opsawg-ipfix-fixes-04 (a.k.a., simple-fixes) with updates that:
  – Fix shortcomings in the description of an IE
  – Require adding a pointer to an existing IANA registry
  – Are meant to ensure a consistent structure when calling an existing IANA registry
  – Fix broken pointers, orphan section references, etc.
  – Address comments from the Designated Experts
Walking Through the Required Changes (2)

• Move issues that require new IEs from simple-fixes to draft-boucadair-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh-01
  – ipv6ExtensionHeaders
    • The IE does not cover the full EHs range
    • There is no procedure to update the IPFIX registry when a new EH is assigned
    • The behavior when all bits are exhausted is not specified
  – tcpOptions
    • Only TCP options having a kind <= 63
    • No means to export shared TCP options

• To ensure protocol parity, edited draft-boucadair-opsawg-tsvwg-udp-ipfix-04 to cover UDP options
  – The motivation for exporting UDP options data is similar to the one for exporting TCP options
  – The IEs design is aligned with draft-boucadair-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh
Why an RFC is Needed for the Simple Fixes I-D?

• ...Especially that the policy for the IPFIX registry is Expert Review

• But RFC 7013 says:

“This process should not in any way be construed as allowing the IE-DOCTORS to overrule IETF consensus. Specifically, Information Elements in the IANA IE registry that were added with IETF consensus require IETF consensus for revision or deprecation.”
What’s Next?

• Request WGLC for draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc7125-update

• Request WG adoption for the following I-D set:
  – draft-boucla-opsawg-ipfix-fixes
  – draft-boucadair-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh
  – draft-boucadair-opsawg-tsvwg-udp-ipfix

• The last two documents may be merged, but we prefer to keep them separate because of the dependency on the UDP Options spec (tsvwg)