

INTERNET DRAFT  
<[draft-huitema-multi6-experiment-00.txt](#)>  
June 20, 2003  
Expires December 20, 2003

C. Huitema  
Microsoft  
D. Kessens  
Nokia

## Simple Dual Homing Experiment

Status of this memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

This document is an Internet-Draft. Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

Abstract

The current Internet routing architecture does not provide for a scalable multi-homing solution. Scalability of the interdomain routing architecture is already a problem and is expected to become an even larger problem if millions of home users and small businesses will start to use multi-homing technology in order to achieve redundancy and reliability that traditionally can only be provided by BGP multi-homing.

Authors believe that it is possible to solve the problems of end-users and small businesses with a multi-addressing mechanism and source address selection mechanism instead of using the routing system.

This draft proposes a setup that will allow us to try a multi-addressing solution. Instead of trying to solve the problems for more complex network setups, it was decided to go for a solution that covers most simple setups but that cover the majority of home and small business networks. Authors believe that we can more easily reach progress by starting with a simple solution that can later be extended to solve the issues of a larger class of users.

### 1. Simple dual homing problem statement

In order to make progress towards an IPv6 site multi-homing

solution, we propose to start with a simple problem: how to multi-home the simplest site, i.e. a site composed of a single link, e.g. a switched Ethernet network.

We believe that addressing the problem of simple, small networks is both urgent and useful. Providing a simple solution for the most numerous networks drastically reduces the danger that generalized multi-homing poses to the Internet. A small network solution may or may not be easily extensible to larger networks, but we know that there are order of magnitude less large networks than small. If we have a solution for the small networks, the scope of the remaining problem will "only" be the hundreds of thousands of larger networks, rather than the hundreds of millions of home networks.

Many small business networks use a simple pattern of multi-homing today: the very small business network is composed of a switched Ethernet, combining fixed line and wireless links; it connects to the Internet through two independent connections, such as two DSL lines. There is no coordination between the two providers. In a typical IPv4 set-up, each Internet connection terminates in a different NAT/Firewall; one connection is used as back-up, and is turned on if the other connection fails.

Other examples of this simple multi-homing pattern include home networks connected to a broadband service but also maintaining a dial-up connection for back-up; and home networks connected to two broadband connections such as DSL and cable, or perhaps wireless services.

## 2. Define a simple set of requirements

For the small networks, the basic motivation for multi-homing is redundancy and reliability. Reliability is defined, as a minimum, as the possibility to maintain operation in cases of failure of one the Internet provider connections [[Black](#)].

We will expect the site to contain both "simple" and "smart" hosts. Simple hosts have an implementation of IPv6 conformant to [RFC 2641](#); smart hosts are supposed to be upgraded to become "site multi-homing aware". The reliability expectation is slightly different for the two kinds of hosts. In case of failure of a provider connection, the simple hosts may suffer from a temporary loss of connectivity; the expectation is that operation will shortly resume over the remaining connection; this matches the expectation of current IPv4 "back-up" services. On the contrary, the smart hosts are expected to obtain better services: established TCP-IP connections should survive the loss of one of the provider connections; if connections cannot be maintained, operation should at least resume immediately; it should be possible to perform some amount of load balancing between the two connections.

We assume that it is entirely acceptable that the two Internet

providers each allocate a "provider aggregated" prefix to the small site. Simple hosts are expected to auto-configure addresses using at least one of these prefixes; smart hosts are expected to auto-configure addresses using both. It is reasonable to expect that hosts have to be renumbered after a connectivity event, although we also expect that addresses configured with one prefix will remain valid as long as this prefix is valid.

The following section details specific problems that must be solved by the simple multi-homing solution.

### 3. Multi-homing issues

The five multi-homing issues that we want to solve are ingress filtering, avoidance of a "dead connection" for outbound connections, avoidance of a dead address for inbound connections, connection maintenance and exit selection. We believe that the solution to these problems is in the realm of engineering, not research. For each problem, we give hint of one or several possible solutions. We also believe that relatively simple solutions are possible, and should be preferred to "innovative" constructs.

#### 3.1. Ingress filtering

We assume that each of the ISP may perform ingress filtering, and will reject packets whose source address does not belong to the prefix allocated to the network by that ISP. This leads to a possible failure scenario:

- \* Host choose source address A
- \* Default route leads to router B
- \* Router B forwards the packet to ISP B
- \* Packet is dropped by ingress filtering.

The multi-homing proposal must present a solution to this problem. We believe that this solution can be engineered by simple improvements in the small site exit routers, such as checking the source address of the Internet bound packets and redirecting these packets to the "right" exit router in case of problem. This solution should not depend on any particular host behavior, beyond what is mandated by the existing IPv6 specification, notably Neighbor Discovery and Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [RFC2640, [RFC2641](#), [RFC 2462](#)]. However, smart hosts may improve on the basic solution, e.g. by selecting a next hop exit router as a function of the source address.

#### 3.2. Avoid using dead router for outbound connections

The purpose of multi-homing is to provide redundancy, and to avoid the following failure scenario:

- \* Router A is dead, or link to ISP A is dead

- \* Host continue sending using source address A

Because of ingress filtering, router B cannot forward the packets. The multi-homing proposal must present a solution to this problem, and the solution must work for both simple hosts and smart hosts. We believe that a solution can be engineered by an appropriate use of "router announce" messages, such as stopping advertisement of a provider prefix if the provider connection is unavailable, or possibly advertising this prefix as "deprecated." Smart host may improve on that solution by detecting the loss of connectivity independently of the router advertisements, and automatically preferring the other address for new connections.

### 3.3. Avoid using dead address for outbound connections

A variation of the previous failure scenario occurs when a service is hosted on the small network:

- \* Service advertises both address A and address B in the DNS
- \* Router A is dead, or link to ISP A is dead
- \* A remote client selects address A to reach the service
- \* The connection fails

The multi-homing proposal must present a solution to this problem, and the solution must work for both simple hosts and smart hosts. A possible solution is to expect remote hosts to retry the connection attempt using the second address; another solution is to somehow update the DNS.

### 3.4. Maintaining connections

Solving the ingress filtering and dead router problem provides small site with a functional multi-homing solution, but does not resolve the following failure scenario:

- \* Host has connection with peer P using address A
- \* Router A or ISP A fails
- \* Existing connections break

Obviously, the desired outcome is that connections should not break. However, in a similar IPv4 set-up today, e.g. main connection backed up by a DSL line, turning on backup actually breaks connections. Thus, we accept the loss of connections in the case of the simple hosts; the simple hosts will simply have to reestablish their connections.

However, the multi-homing proposal should provide smart hosts with a solution to this problem. We believe that it is possible to engineer this solution by using a variation of Mobile IPv6.

### 3.5. Use the right exit/entrance

Even if we are able to provide redundancy and reliability, the dual homed networks are still exposed to the following failure mode:

- \* Peer picks address A rather than address B
- \* Resulting traffic is routed on a slower path or on a congested connection
- \* Performance looks terrible

The multi-homing proposal should try to provide a solution to this problem, and this solution should be available at least to smart hosts. This is however not as strong a requirement as the other four, as this problem is not solved today in any technology short of full blown traffic engineering. In any case, the goal is not to obtain an absolute optimization of network usage, but rather to avoid the most obnoxious results of load imbalance.

We believe that it is possible to engineer a solution using either a smart naming service (a.k.a. DNS load balancing), a routing level optimization such as a randomized choice of exit routers, or possibly a variation of Mobile IPv6 to move existing connections towards a less loaded path.

#### 4. Further study

The goal of the simple dual homing exercise is to provide a simple solution to the simple sites. We expect further revisions of this draft to report on the results of actual experiments, to detail how proposed solutions fared during these experiments, and to recommend those solutions that were found to work well.

Once this goal is achieved, we believe that the solution can be extended in two directions: extend the solution to medium size sites; and extend the solution to accommodate a form of provider independent addressing.

The extension to medium size sites can be thought as a progress on a scale of complexity: first, extend the solution to multilink subnets, where all exit routers are on the same link; second, extend the solution to routed network, where all exit routers are on the same link; and third, extend the solution to routed network, where exit routers are present at different locations.

Provider independent addressing is often used today by large IPv4 sites, which simply obtain a prefix from a registry, use this prefix for internal addresses, and insure that the prefix is distributed in the global routing tables. We believe that similar solutions will be available for large IPv6 sites, but we are also very aware that they cannot be extended to the majority of smaller IPv6 sites. Yet, the small IPv6 sites may benefit from some form of provider independent addresses, e.g. in order to advertise addresses that don't depend on a particular provider configuration. It may be possible for these sites to use a "virtual IP" solution, in which connectivity through

a PI address is overlaid on top of the regular provider based addressing. This can be thought of as an extension of the simple solution.

## 5. Security Considerations

The proposed solution doesn't change anything to the way Internet routing works. IP packets with a source address out of a prefix from ISP A will leave the exit router on the link that connects to ISP so packet spoofing will not be an issue (or at least, this solution will not make it worse).

Smart hosts will not use any mechanisms that will make them more vulnerable for attack than simple hosts. Both smart and simple hosts are vulnerable to the same security risks that are associated with connecting hosts to the Internet and can be addressed with standard security technology.

## 6. IANA Considerations

This document does not request any IANA action.

## 7. Copyright

The following copyright notice is copied from [RFC 2026](#) [Bradner, 1996], [Section 10.4](#), and describes the applicable copyright for this document.

Copyright (C) The Internet Society March 21, 2001. All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING

BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## 8. Intellectual Property

The following notice is copied from [RFC 2026](#) [[Bradner](#), 1996], [Section 10.4](#), and describes the position of the IETF concerning intellectual property claims made against this document.

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use other technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

## 9. Acknowledgements

The multi-addressing idea has been debated multiple times by members of the multi6 working group. This draft benefited from detailed comments provided by Tony Li and Lode Coene.

## 10. References

### Normative references

[RFC2460] Deering, S., and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), December 1998.

[RFC2460] Deering, S., and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), December 1998.

[RFC2461] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., and W. Simpson, "Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2461](#), December 1998.

[Black] Benjamin Black, Vijay Gill, Joe Abley, "Goals for IPv6 Site-Multihoming Architectures", IETF work in progress, May 2003.

[Bradner] Bradner, S. [ed], "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", [RFC 2026](#), October 1996

Informative references

#### 11. Authors' Address

Christian Huitema  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

Email: [huitema@microsoft.com](mailto:huitema@microsoft.com)

David Kessens  
313 Fairchild Drive  
Mountain View, CA 94041

Email: [david.kessens@nokia.com](mailto:david.kessens@nokia.com)



Table of Contents: