

---

# Internet Multicast Addressing Architecture

draft-ietf-mboned-addrarch-05.txt

Pekka Savola, CSC/FUNET

# AD review issues - summary

---

- Issue summary mails on the list: Dec 20th, Jan 19th
  
- Major issue on IANA policy preferences
  - Was deferred in 3171-update (2002) and 3171bis (2004)
  - Unable to agree whether to tighten IANA policy or not
    - Attempts to resolve have always died off
  - Is this problem worth solving?
    - Lots of energy and time will be spent
    - Will delay the doc 1-2 years
    - Now some new hope: eGLOP, IPv4-unicast-prefix-based
    - Alternative: keep going as before and revisit the issue every two years

# AD review issues 1/3

---

- The impact of this doc on IANA policies
  - The draft implies IANA policies should be different
    - E.g., no big allocations to networks; tightened assignment policy
  - The draft doesn't explicitly request changing policies though
  - Options (possible policies in the next slide)
    - no change to IANA policy (and reword the draft)
    - change IANA policies
    - change (create) IANA designated expert guidelines
- (Changing policies/guidelines either here or at RFC3171bis)

# AD review issues 2/3

---

## ■ IANA assignment policies (if changed)

- If/when eGLOP + IPv4 unicast-prefix-based is available, change IANA policy to:
  - ▶ 224.0.0.0/24 ("local network control"): Specification Required + Expert Review?
  - ▶ 224.0.1.0/24 ("internetwork control"): Specification Required + Expert Review?
  - ▶ 224.0.{2-255}.0/24 ("adhoc"): Specification req., Expert Review; maximum 1 address per assignee
  - ▶ The rest of 224.0.0.0/8: IETF Consensus?
- ▶ Is this too complex? Simpler solutions?
- Goal: retain the ranges for IETF, other SDO use and other cases where interoperability is important.
- Process issue: Do it here or in RFC3171bis?
- Potential problem: does this result in vendors just making up addresses? Using 239/8?

# AD review issues 3/3

---

- 32-bit AS number holders have no GLOP, IANA allocations have a role?
  - Suggestion: resurrect IPv4 unicast-prefix-based, eGLOP
  
- Should MADCAP and eGLOP be made Historic?
  - eGLOP pushed forward in RIRs by Marshall
    - That should be OK if gets through
  
  - MADCAP implementations exist, some deployment
    - MADCAP should stay on Stds Track for now?

# Steps forward

---

- This doc will get stalled; contributors:
  - eGLOP implementation at RIRs, availability to the public
  - IPv4-unicast-prefix based completion
  - RFC3171bis revision or IANA assignment policy discussion