

IPNGWG Working Group  
Internet Draft  
[draft-ietf-ipngwg-scoping-arch-01.txt](#)  
March 2000  
Expires September 2000

S. Deering  
Cisco Systems  
B. Haberman  
Nortel Networks  
B. Zill  
Microsoft

## IP Version 6 Scoped Address Architecture

### Status of this Memo

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

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/lid-abstracts.txt>.

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

### Abstract

This document specifies the architectural characteristics, expected behavior, and usage of IPv6 addresses of different scopes

### 1. Introduction

The Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) introduces the concept of limited scope addresses to the IP lexicon. While operational practice with IPv4 has included the concept of a private address space (net 10, etc.), the design of IPv6 incorporates such addresses into its base architecture. This document defines terms associated with such addresses and describes mechanisms for their behavior.

## [2.](#) Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC 2119](#)].

## [3.](#) Basic Terminology

The terms link, interface, node, host, and router are defined in [[RFC 2460](#)]. The definitions of unicast address scopes (link-local, site-local, and global) and multicast address scopes (node-local, link-local, etc.) are contained in [[RFC 2373](#)].

## [4.](#) Address Scope

Every IPv6 address has a specific scope, that is, a topological "distance" within which the address may be used as a unique identifier for an interface. The scope of an address is encoded as part of the address, as specified in [[RFC 2373](#)].

For unicast addresses, there are three defined scopes:

- o Link-local scope, for uniquely identifying interfaces within a single link only.
- o Site-local scope, for uniquely identifying interfaces within a single site only. A "site" is, by intent, not rigorously defined, but is typically expected to cover a region of topology that belongs to a single organization and is located within a single geographic location, such as an office, an office complex, or a campus. A personal residence may be treated as a site (for example, when the residence obtains Internet access via a public Internet service provider), or as a part of a site (for example, when the residence obtains Internet access via an employer's or school's site).
- o Global scope, for uniquely identifying interfaces anywhere in the Internet.

For multicast addresses, there are fourteen possible scopes, ranging from node-local to global (including both link-local and site-local). A node-local multicast address serves as a unique identifier for an interface within a single node only; such an address is used only for "loopback" delivery of multicasts within a

single node, for example, as a form of inter-process communication within a computer.

There is an ordering relationship among scopes:

- o for unicast scopes, link-local is a smaller scope than site-local, and site-local is a smaller scope than global.
- o for multicast scopes, scopes with lesser values in the "scop" subfield of the multicast address [RFC 2373, [section 2.7](#)] are smaller than scopes with greater values, with node-local being the smallest and global being the largest.

However, two scopes of different size may cover the exact same region of topology, for example, a site may consist of a single link, in which both link-local and site-local scope effectively cover the same topological "distance".

## [5](#). Scope Zones

A scope zone, or simply a zone, is a connected region of topology of a given scope. For example, the set of links connected by routers within a particular site, and the interfaces attached to those links, comprise a single zone of site-local scope. To understand the distinction between scopes and zones, observe that the topological regions within two different sites are considered to be two DIFFERENT zones, but of the SAME scope.

Addresses of a given (non-global) scope may be re-used in different zones of that scope. The zone to which a particular non-global address pertains is not encoded in the address itself, but rather is determined by context, such as the interface from which it is sent or received.

Zones of the different scopes are defined as follows:

- o A node-local zone (for multicast only) consists of a single interface on a node. [Note: node-local scope would have been more accurately named interface-local.]
- o A link-local zone (for unicast and multicast) consists of

a single link and all the interfaces attached to that link.

- o There is a single zone of global scope (for both unicast and multicast), comprising all the links and interfaces in the Internet.
- o The boundaries of zones of scope other than node-local, link-local, and global must be defined and configured by network administrators. The only required such

Deering, Haberman, Zill

3

Internet Draft

IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture

September 2000

boundaries are site boundaries. A site boundary serves for both unicast and multicast.

Zone boundaries are relatively static features, not changing in response to short-term changes in topology. Thus, the requirement that the topology within a zone be "connected" is intended to include links and interfaces that may be only occasionally connected. For example, a residential node or network that obtains Internet access by dial-up to an employer's site may be treated as part of the employer's site-local zone even when the dial-up link is disconnected. Similarly, a failure of a router, interface, or link that causes a zone to become partitioned does not split that zone into multiple zones; rather, the different partitions are still considered to belong to the same zone.

Zones have the following additional properties:

- o Zone boundaries cut through nodes, not links. (There are two exceptions: the global zone has no boundary, and the boundary of a node-local zone conceptually cuts through an interface between a node and a link.)
- o Zones of the same scope cannot overlap, i.e., they can have no links or interfaces in common.
- o A zone of a given scope (less than global) falls completely within zones of larger scope, i.e., a smaller scope zone cannot include more topology than any larger scope zone with which it shares any links or interfaces.

Each interface belongs to one node-local zone, one link-local zone, one site-local zone, and the global zone. Each link belongs to one link-local zone, one site-local zone, and the global zone. An

interface or link only belongs to additional (i.e., multicast) zones if it falls within the configured boundaries of such additional zones.

## 6. Zone Indices

Because the same address of a given (non-global) scope can be re-used in different zones of that scope, a node must have a means -- other than examining the address itself -- of associating non-global addresses with particular zones when sending, receiving, or forwarding packets containing such addresses. This is accomplished by assigning a local "zone index" to each zone to which a node is attached. Each attached zone of the same scope must be assigned a different index value; attached zones of different scopes can re-use the same index values.

Deering, Haberman, Zill

4

Internet Draft

## IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture

September 2000

The assignment of zone indices is illustrated in the example in the figure below:




Figure 1 : Zone Indices Example

This example node has five interfaces:

- o A loopback interface, which can be thought of as an interface to a phantom link -- the "loopback link" -- that goes nowhere,
- o Two interfaces to the same Ethernet,
- o An interface to a point-to-point link, and
- o A tunnel interface (e.g., the abstract endpoint of an IPv6-over-IPv6 tunnel [[RFC 2473](#)], presumably established over either the Ethernet or the point-to-point link.)

It is thus attached to five node-local zones, identified by the interface indices 1 through 5.

Because the two Ethernet interfaces are attached to the same link, the node is attached to only four link-local zones, identified by link indices 1 through 4.

It is attached to three site-local zones: one imaginary one to which the loopback interface belongs, one to which the Ethernet and the point-to-point link belong, and one to which the tunnel belongs (perhaps because it is a tunnel to another organization). These site-local zones are identified by the site indices 1 through 3.

Deering, Haberman, Zill

5

Internet Draft      IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture      September 2000

The zone indices are strictly local to the node. For example, the node on the other end of the point-to-point link may well be using entirely different interface, link, and site index values for that link.

The zone index values are arbitrary. An implementation may use any value it chooses to label a zone as long as it maintains the requirement that the index value of each attached zone of the same scope must be unique within the node. Implementations choosing to follow the recommended basic API [[RFC 2553](#)] will also want to restrict their index values to those that can be represented by the `sin6_scope_id` field of a `sockaddr_in6`.

An implementation may also support the concept of a "default" zone for each scope. It is convenient to reserve the index value zero, at each scope, to mean "use the default zone". This default index can also be used to identify the zone for any scopes for which the

node has not assigned any indices, such as the various multicast-only scopes.

There is at present no way for a node to automatically determine which of its interfaces belongs to the same zones, e.g., the same link or the same site. In the future, protocols may be developed to determine that information. In the absence of such protocols, an implementation must provide a means for manual assignment and/or reassignment of zone indices. Furthermore, to avoid the need to perform manual configuration in most cases, an implementation should, by default, initially assign zone indices as follows:

- o A unique interface index for each interface
- o A unique link index for each interface
- o A single site index for all interfaces

Then, manual configuration would be necessary only for the less common cases of nodes with multiple interfaces to a single link, interfaces to different sites, or interfaces to zones of different (multicast-only) scopes.

## [7. Sending Packets](#)

When an upper-layer protocol sends a packet to a non-global destination address, the node must also identify the intended zone to be used for transmission.

Note that there is one exception to the above statement: when sending to the IPv6 unicast loopback address, `::1`, there is no need to identify the intended zone, even though that address is non-global. Conceptually, the unicast loopback address is a link-local address for a node's loopback interface, and is never assigned to any other interface. Therefore, it unambiguously identifies a single zone of link-scope, that being the phantom loopback link.

Although identification of an outgoing interface is sufficient to identify an intended zone (because each interface is attached to no more than one zone of each scope), that is more specific than desired in many cases. For example, when sending to a site-local

unicast address, from a node that has more than one interface to the intended site, the upper layer protocol may not care which of those interfaces is used for the transmission, but rather would prefer to leave that choice to the routing function in the IP layer. Thus, the upper-layer requires the ability to specify a zone index, rather than an interface index, when sending to a non-global, non-loopback destination address.

There may also be cases where the upper-layer wishes to restrict the choice of outgoing interface to those belonging to a zone of smaller scope than the destination address. For example, when sending to a site-local destination, the upper-layer may wish to specify a specific link on which the packet should be transmitted, but leave the choice of which specific interface to use on that link to the IP layer. One possible reason for such behavior is that the source address chosen by the upper-layer is of smaller scope than the destination, e.g., when using a link-local source address and a site-local destination address. Thus, the upper layer requires the ability, when sending a packet, to specify any zone of scope less than or equal to the scope of the destination address, including the case in which the destination address is of global scope. For this reason, an implementation might find it useful to assign a distinct value for each zone index, so that they are unique across all zones, regardless of scope.

(Authors' note to selves: Think about distinct values for default at each scope level.)

## 8. Receiving Packets

When an upper-layer protocol receives a packet containing a non-global source or destination address, the zone to which that address pertains can be determined from the arrival interface, because the arrival interface can be attached to only one zone of the same scope as the address under consideration.

## 9. Forwarding

When a router receives a packet addressed to a node other than itself, it must take the zone of the destination and source addresses into account as follows:



- o The zone of the destination address is determined by the scope of the address and arrival interface of the packet. The next-hop interface is chosen by looking up the destination address in a (conceptual) routing table specific to that zone. That routing table is restricted to refer only to interfaces belonging to that zone.
- o After the next-hop interface is chosen, the zone of the source address is considered. As with the destination address, the zone of the source address is determined by the scope of the address and arrival interface of the packet. If transmitting the packet on the chosen next-hop interface would cause the packet to leave the zone of the source address, i.e., cross a zone boundary of the scope of the source address, then the packet is discarded and an ICMP Destination Unreachable message [[RFC 2463](#)] with Code 2 ("beyond scope of source address") is sent to the source of the packet.

Note that the above procedure applies for addresses of all scopes, including link-local. Thus, if a router receives a packet with a link-local destination address that is not one of the router's own link-local addresses on the arrival link, the router is expected to try to forward the packet to the destination on that link (subject to successful determination of the destination's link-layer address via the Neighbor Discovery protocol [[RFC 2461](#)]). The forwarded packet may be transmitted back out the arrival interface, or out any other interface attached to the same link.

A node that receives a packet addressed to itself and containing a Routing Header with more than zero Segments Left [[RFC 2460](#), [section 4.4](#)] swaps the original destination address with the next address in the Routing Header. Then the above forwarding rules are applied, using the new destination address. An implementation MUST NOT examine additional addresses in the Routing header to determine whether they are crossing boundaries for their scopes. Thus, it is possible, though generally inadvisable, to use a Routing Header to convey a non-global address across its associated zone boundary.

## [10](#). Routing

When a routing protocol determines that it is operating on a zone boundary, it MUST protect inter-zone integrity and maintain intra-zone connectivity.

In order to maintain connectivity, the routing protocol must be able to create forwarding information for the global prefixes as well as for all of the zone prefixes for each of its attached zones. The most straightforward way of doing this is to create (conceptual) forwarding tables for each specific zone.

To protect inter-zone integrity routers must be selective in the prefix information that is shared with neighboring routers. Routers routinely exchange routing information with neighboring routers. When a router is transmitting this routing information, it must not include any information about zones other than the zones assigned to the interface used to transmit the information.




Figure 2: Multi-Sited Router

As an example, the router in Figure 2 must exchange routing information on five interfaces. The information exchanged is as follows:

- o Interface 1
  - o All global prefixes
  - o All site prefixes learned from Interfaces 1, 2, and 5
- o Interface 2

- o All global prefixes
- o All site prefixes learned from Interfaces 1, 2, and 5

Deering, Haberman, Zill

9

Internet Draft      IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture      September 2000

- o Interface 3
  - o All global prefixes
  - o All site prefixes learned from Interface 3
- o Interface 4
  - o All global prefixes
  - o All site prefixes learned from Interface 4
- o Interface 5
  - o All global prefixes
  - o All site prefixes learned from Interfaces 1, 2, and 5

By imposing route exchange rules, zone integrity is maintained by keeping all zone-specific routing information contained within the zone.

## 11. Related Documents

The following list is a set of documents that are related to IPv6 address scope:

- o Site Prefixes in Neighbor Discovery, [draft-ietf-ipngwg-site-prefixes-03.txt](#)
- o An Extension of Format for IPv6 Scoped Addresses, [draft-ietf-ipngwg-scopedaddr-format-00.txt](#)
- o Default Address Selection for IPv6, [draft-ietf-ipngwg-default-addr-select-00.txt](#)
- o Basic Socket Interface Extensions for IPv6, [RFC 2553](#)
- o Advanced Sockets API for IPv6, [draft-ietf-ipngwg-](#)

## [12.](#) Mobility

TBD

## [13.](#) Textual Representation

TBD

Deering, Haberman, Zill

10

Internet Draft      IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture      September 2000

## [14.](#) Security Considerations

The routing section of this document specifies a set of guidelines that allow routers to prevent zone-specific information from leaking out of each site. If site boundary routers allow site routing information to be forwarded outside of the site, the integrity of the site could be compromise

## [15.](#) References

- [RFC 2119] S. Bradner, "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), [BCP14](#), March 1999.
- [RFC 2373] Hinden, R., and Deering, S., "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 2373](#), July 1998.
- [RFC 2460] Deering, S., and Hinden, R., "Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), December 1998.
- [RFC 2473] Conta, A., and Deering, S., "Generic Packet Tunneling in IPv6 Specification", [RFC 2473](#), December 1998.
- [RFC 2463] Conta, A., and Deering, S., "Internet Control Message Protocol ([RFC 2463](#)) for Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2463](#), December 1998.
- [RFC 2461] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., and Simpson, W., "Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2461](#), December 1998.

[RFC 2553] Gilligan, R., Thomson, S., Bound, J., and Stevens, W.,  
"Basic Socket Interface Extensions for IPv6", [RFC 2553](#),  
March 1999.

## Acknowledgements

## Authors' Addresses

Stephen E. Deering  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134-1706  
USA

Phone: +1-408-527-8213  
Fax: +1-408-527-8213

Deering, Haberman, Zill

11

Internet Draft      IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture      September 2000

Email: [deering@cisco.com](mailto:deering@cisco.com)

Brian Haberman  
Nortel Networks  
4309 Emperor Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Durham, NC 27703  
USA

Phone: +1-919-992-4439  
Email: [haberman@nortelnetworks.com](mailto:haberman@nortelnetworks.com)

Brian D. Zill  
Microsoft Research  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399  
USA

Phone: +1-425-703-3568  
Fax: +1-425-936-7329  
Email: [bzill@microsoft.com](mailto:bzill@microsoft.com)

