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1. The section on the P-ITR was almost completely rewritten:
   1. Effects on the DFZ size
   2. BGP announcements’ directions have been clarified
   3. Scenarios not supported by the WG have been removed

2. Mapping section updated:
   1. How one can become a MSP
   2. Redundant Map-Servers

3. Editorial/minor changes
Scenario I: LISP+BGP

- Less disruptive (site point of view)
- LISP and legacy sites
  - No path stretch
- No decrease DFZ
  - Early stage
Scenario II: MSP P-ITR Service

- Useful for new PI (EID) allocations
- No BGP infrastructure at the new LISP site (besides ALT)
- Mitigates prefix deaggregation for TE purposes
- Path stretch >= 1
Scenario III: Tier-1 P-ITR Service

- Path stretch ≈ 1
- Issue with non-global coverage of announced prefixes
  - Most likely to operate in conjunction with previous scenarios
- At some stage, incentives to deploy P-ITRs
  - Attract traffic
• Clarified the conditions to become a Mapping Service Provider (MSP)
  – EID registrars
  – Third parties: BGP session with an existing ALT participant
• Redundant Map-Server deployments are desirable
  – ETRs are configured to send Map-Register messages to all Map-Servers
  – Current known BGP practices can be used on the LISP+ALT BGP to achieve fail-over
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Comments/Questions?
WG adoption?