

Workgroup: Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft:  
draft-akimichi-6man-ra-prefixlen-00

Updates: [4861](#) (if approved)

Published: 5 October 2021

Intended Status: Standards Track

Expires: 8 April 2022

Authors: A. Ogawa	K. Nishizuka
Professional writer	NTT Communications
Y. Atarashi	A. Kanai
Alaxala Networks Co.	NTT Communications

## **Host behavior to short prefix length**

### **Abstract**

The Prefix Information Option in the IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Router Advertisement message defines an 8-bit prefix length field. Prefix List entries are created using the prefix length in the Prefix Information Option. The Conceptual Model of a Host described in RFC 4861[[RFC4861](#)] does not clarify behavior of a host, when a short prefix length is received. This document updates RFC 4861(if approved), and clarifies that hosts SHOULD NOT accept prefix length shorter than /64.

### **Status of This Memo**

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 8 April 2022.

### **Copyright Notice**

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of

publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Problem Statement](#)
- [3. Limiting Prefix Length](#)
- [4. Update to RFC 4861](#)
- [5. Security Considerations](#)
- [6. Acknowledgements](#)
- [7. Normative References](#)
- [Authors' Addresses](#)

## 1. Introduction

RFC 4861 describes a conceptual model of a host for Neighbor Discovery. Conceptual data structures in the conceptual model includes the Prefix List.

The Prefix List is,

"A list of the prefixes that define a set of addresses that are on-link. Prefix List entries are created from information received in Router Advertisements."

The Prefix Information Option (PIO) in the IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Router Advertisement defines an 8-bit prefix length field. When a host is configured to accept RAs, it will add prefixes included in the PIO, into the Prefix List. When prefixes are added into the Prefix List of a host, the prefix added will be assumed on-link.

The PIO in the Router Advertisement has an 8-bit prefix length field. The value ranges from 0 to 128[RFC4861]. IPv6 Address Architecture[RFC4291] requires the length of interface ID to be 64 bits long. RFC 4291 states,

"For all unicast addresses, except those that start with the binary value 000, Interface IDs are required to be 64 bits long"

Therefore, on-link prefixes with bits shorter than 64 bits violate RFC 4291.

The SLAAC specification[RFC4862] refers RFC 4291 about the interface identifier length. And current host implementations do not accept prefix length other than 64, in the SLAAC process.

## 2. Problem Statement

When an RA with short prefix length field with autonomous address-configuration flag value 1 is received, some host implementations (Windows, macOS, Linux) will not add an IPv6 address to the network interface. Even though a new IPv6 address is not added, the host assumes the prefix as on-link. When autonomous address-configuration flag value is 0, the host will not run the SLAAC process, but assume that the prefix is on-link.

Current implementations accept up to /4 as prefix length. Because current IANA allocation of GUA is limited to 2000::/3, it would be very easy to mislead the whole IPv6 Internet as on-link. Which can lead to a DoS attack, MITM attack, etc.

## 3. Limiting Prefix Length

RFC 3756[[RFC3756](#)] Section 4.2.5. describes mitigation for DoS attacks using rogue RAs.

"As an example, one possible approach to limiting the damage of this attack is to require advertised on-link prefixes be /64s (otherwise it's easy to advertise something short like 0/0 and this attack is very easy)."

RFC 4291[[RFC4291](#)] limits the interface identifier length to 64 bits. When IID is 64 bits, the subnet prefix length will be 64 bits. Therefore, the prefix length other than 64 bits is rogue, and the host should not accept the prefix information.

## 4. Update to RFC 4861

If approved, this draft adds the following sentence and updates Section 6. of RFC 4861.

A host SHOULD NOT accept a prefix length shorter than 64.

## 5. Security Considerations

The purpose of this document is to mitigate adverse effects caused by a rogue RA. Limitation of the prefix length as described in Section 4.

## 6. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Tatsuya Hayashi, Yuji Suga and Katsushi Kobayashi for many comments.

## 7. Normative References

**[RFC3756]**

Nikander, P., Ed., Kempf, J., and E. Nordmark, "IPv6 Neighbor Discovery (ND) Trust Models and Threats", RFC 3756, DOI 10.17487/RFC3756, May 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3756>>.

**[RFC4291]**

Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", RFC 4291, DOI 10.17487/RFC4291, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4291>>.

**[RFC4861]**

Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", RFC 4861, DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.

**[RFC4862]**

Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", RFC 4862, DOI 10.17487/RFC4862, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4862>>.

**Authors' Addresses**

Akimichi Ogawa  
Professional writer

Email: [akimichi@sfc.wide.ad.jp](mailto:akimichi@sfc.wide.ad.jp)

Kaname Nishizuka  
NTT Communications

Email: [kaname@nttv6.jp](mailto:kaname@nttv6.jp)

Yoshifumi Atarashi  
Alaxala Networks Co.

Email: [atarashi@alaxala.net](mailto:atarashi@alaxala.net)

Akira Kanai  
NTT Communications

Email: [a.kanai@ntt.com](mailto:a.kanai@ntt.com)