

Updates & Next Steps for draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc7125-update and Companion IPFIX I-Ds

IETF#116
March 2023

M. Boucadair (Orange), B. Claise (Huawei), T. Reddy (Nokia)

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 - Simple-ipfix-fixes *may or may not be published* as an RFC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*)