Decisions Made

- Encapsulation or agglomeration?
- Same packet format, or different?
- Support Legacy RAIO?
- Support L2RA?
- Encapsulation √
- Agglomeration
- Compatible packet format
- New packet format ✓
- Legacy RAIO
- No Legacy RAIO √
Remaining decisions

- Use Relay Agent Identifier Suboption?
- Define L2RA in this draft or separate draft?
- How are L3 relay agents chained?
- Prefer inner or outer options?
- Relays configurable to drop relay-forward messages?
Use Relay-ID suboption?

- Not a unique identifier
- Should we just define an identifier for this?
- Does it need to be unique, or is Relay-ID actually the right thing?
Define L2RA in this draft?

- Existing L2RA draft is about existing practices, and is not a standard.
- This draft requires a rigorous standard for L2RA.
- Draft current contains text standardizing L2RA.
- ?
Agent chaining mechanism

- I assumed intermediate relays would be configured with next-hop relay addresses.
- Huang Lu assumed L3 relays would intercept outgoing packets.
- ?
Inner or outer options?

- If two relay agents send the same relay suboption, what do we do?
- Prefer inner: closer to the client, more accurate
- Prefer outer: closer to the server, more trustworthy
Relays configurable to drop?

- One way to resolve inner vs. outer:
- Relay agent at edge of provider network drops relay-forward packets
- Now untrusted part of network can’t send encapsulations at all.
- Win?