LISP Canonical Address Format (LCAF)

draft-ietf-lisp-rfc8060bis-02
IETF 123 / Madrid

Alvaro Retana (aretana.ietf@gmail.com) (Editor)

Background

RFC8060 (LISP Canonical Address Format) is an Experimental RFC.

- Formally Updated by RFC9306 (Vendor-Specific LCAF) and RFC-to-be-draft-ietf-lisp-geo (LISP Geo-Coordinate Use-Cases). Both RFCs are Experimental

- rfc8378bis (Signal-Free LISP Multicast / Proposed Standard) Normatively depends on it.

Objective: change the status to Proposed Standard.

Current Situation (-02)

-00: rfc8060 + updated references + XMLv3 formatting.

Changes since -00:

- Incorporated **Errata** ID: 7252 (https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7252).
- Eliminated mentions of **"experiment" and "unapproved"** by moving LCAFs defined in the section titled "Experimental LISP Canonical Address Applications" into the main section (Section 4).
- Eliminated mentions of **Geo-Coordinates**.
- Updated the **IANA Considerations** table with the full list of Types.
- Eliminated the reference to RFC 3232 ("RFC 1700 Replaced by On-line Database"), which didn't provide context for AFI.
- Moved the reference to RFC 6836 to be Informative; in the text it is used as an example. This addresses the downref.
- To avoid a **downref**, moved the references to RFC 7348 and RFC 7637 to be Informative. This is inline with the other references for similar functionality in the Encapsulation Format LCAF (Section 4.14)

What about “unapproved” LCAF Types?

They are not in the IANA Registry (LCAF Types). Should we include them?

- If implemented then they should be kept in the specification and included in the registry.

- If not implemented:
  - Kept in the specification and included in the registry.
  - Values are deprecated.

Previously “unapproved” Types

Value	LISP LCAF Type Name	Implementation / Deployment
4	Application Data	OpenDaylight
6	Opaque Key	??
8	Nonce Locator	??
14	JSON Data Model	lispers.net / cisco
15	Key/Value Address Pair	OpenDaylight
16	Encapsulation Format	cisco

Next Steps

-03: WG review and comments

-04: Editorial Changes

-05: WG review and comments

-06: Merge rfc9306 (Vendor-Specific LCAF)

-07: WG review and comments

-08: Merge lisp-geo.

-09: WG review and comments

-10: Ready for WGLC.