

Relay Agent Encapsulation

Hui Deng, China Mobile

Ted Lemon, Nominum

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?