

IPv6 Operations Working Group (v6ops)
Internet-Draft
Updates: [7084](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Informational
Expires: November 19, 2020

F. Gont
SI6 Networks
J. Zorz
Go6 Institute
R. Patterson
Sky UK
B. Volz
Cisco
May 18, 2020

Improving the Reaction of Customer Edge Routers to Renumbering Events draft-ietf-v6ops-cpe-slaac-renum-02

Abstract

In scenarios where network configuration information becomes invalid without any explicit signaling of that condition (such as when a Customer Edge Router crashes and reboots without knowledge of the previously-employed configuration information), hosts on the local network will continue using stale network configuration information for an unacceptably long period of time, thus resulting in connectivity problems. This document specifies improvements to Customer Edge Routers that help mitigate the aforementioned problem for typical residential and small office scenarios. This document updates [RFC7084](#).

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 November 19, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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
2.	Improved Customer Edge Router Behavior	2
2.1.	Interface Between WAN-side and LAN-side	3
2.2.	LAN-side Option Lifetimes	4
2.3.	Signaling Stale Configuration Information	6
3.	Recommended Option Lifetimes Configuration Values	8
4.	IANA Considerations	8
5.	Security Considerations	8
6.	Acknowledgments	8
7.	References	9
7.1.	Normative References	9
7.2.	Informative References	9
	Authors' Addresses	10

[1.](#) Introduction

In scenarios where network configuration information becomes invalid without any explicit signaling of that condition, nodes on the local network will continue using stale information for an unacceptably long period of time, thus resulting in connectivity problems. This problem is documented in detail in [[I-D.ietf-v6ops-slaac-renum](#)].

This document specifies improvements to Customer Edge (CE) Routers that help mitigate the aforementioned problem for residential and small office scenarios. This document updates [RFC7084](#).

[2.](#) Improved Customer Edge Router Behavior

This section specifies and clarifies requirements for Customer Edge Routers that can help mitigate the problem discussed in [Section 1](#), particularly when they employ prefixes learned via DHCPv6-Prefix

Delegation (DHCPv6-PD) [[RFC8415](#)] on the WAN-side with Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC) [[RFC4862](#)] or DHCPv6 [[RFC8415](#)] on the LAN-side. The recommendations in this document help improve robustness at the Customer Edge Router (on which the user or ISP may have no control), and do not preclude implementation of host-side improvements such as those specified in [[I-D.gont-6man-slaac-renum](#)].

This document specifies additional LAN-side requirements to requirements L-1 through L-14 specified in [[RFC7084](#)]:

- o L-15: CE routers MUST NOT advertise prefixes via SLAAC or assign addresses or delegate prefixes via DHCPv6 on the LAN-side, employing lifetimes that exceed the remaining lifetimes of the corresponding prefixes learned from the WAN-side via DHCPv6-PD. For more details, see [Section 2.1](#).
- o L-16: CE routers SHOULD advertise capped SLAAC option lifetimes and capped DHCPv6 IA Address Option and IA Prefix Option lifetimes, as specified in [Section 2.2](#).
- o L-17: CE routers MUST signal stale configuration information as specified in [Section 2.3](#).
- o L-18: CE routers SHOULD NOT automatically send DHCPv6-PD RELEASE messages upon reboot events.

[2.1](#). Interface Between WAN-side and LAN-side

The "Preferred Lifetime" and "Valid Lifetime" of Prefix Information Options (PIOs) [[RFC4861](#)] corresponding to prefixes learned via DHCPv6-PD MUST NOT span past the remaining preferred and valid lifetimes of the corresponding DHCPv6-PD prefixes. This means that the advertised "Preferred Lifetime" and "Valid Lifetime" MUST be dynamically adjusted such that they never span past the remaining preferred and valid lifetimes of the corresponding prefixes delegated via DHCPv6-PD on the WAN-side.

Similarly, the "preferred-lifetime" and "valid-lifetime" of DHCPv6 IA Address Options and DHCPv6 IA Prefix Options employed with DHCPv6 on the LAN-side MUST NOT span past the remaining preferred and valid lifetimes of the corresponding prefixes leased via DHCPv6-PD on the WAN-side. This means that the advertised "Preferred Lifetime" and "Valid Lifetime" MUST be dynamically adjusted such that the advertised lifetimes never span past the remaining preferred and valid lifetimes of the corresponding prefixes delegated to the CE Router on the WAN-side via DHCPv6-PD.

This document RECOMMENDS that CE Routers providing stateful address configuration via DHCPv6 sets the DHCPv6 IA Address Option preferred-lifetime to the lesser of the remaining preferred lifetime and ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT, and the valid-lifetime of the same option to the lesser of the remaining valid lifetime and ND_VALID_LIMIT.

This document RECOMMENDS that a CE Router providing DHCPv6-PD on the LAN-side sets the DHCPv6 IA Prefix Option preferred-lifetime to the lesser of the remaining preferred lifetime and ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT, and the valid-lifetime of the same option to the lesser of the remaining valid lifetime and ND_VALID_LIMIT.

RATIONALE:

- * The lifetime values employed for the "Preferred Lifetime" (AdvPreferredLifetime) and "Valid Lifetime" (AdvValidLifetime) of SLAAC Prefix Information Options must never be larger than the remaining lifetimes for the corresponding prefix (as learned via DHCPv6-PD on the WAN-side). This is in line with the requirement from [Section 6.3 of \[RFC8415\]](#), which states that "if the delegated prefix or a prefix derived from it is advertised for stateless address autoconfiguration [[RFC4862](#)], the advertised preferred and valid lifetimes MUST NOT exceed the corresponding remaining lifetimes of the delegated prefix."
- * The lifetime values of prefixes advertised on the LAN-side via SLAAC must be dynamically updated (rather than static values), since otherwise the advertised lifetimes would eventually span past the DHCPv6-PD lifetimes.
- * The same considerations apply for the valid-lifetime and preferred-lifetime of IA Address Options and IA Prefix Options employed with DHCPv6 on the LAN-side.

[2.2.](#) LAN-side Option Lifetimes

CE Routers SHOULD override the default PIO "Preferred Lifetime" and "Valid Lifetime" values from [[RFC4861](#)], and employ shorter lifetime values to improve the robustness to renumbering events, while complying with the requirements from [Section 2.1](#) of this document and the recommendations in [[RFC7772](#)].

This document RECOMMENDS that CE router set the Router Lifetime to ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT. This document also RECOMMENDS that the CE router set the PIO Preferred Lifetime to the lesser of the remaining preferred lifetime (see [Section 2.1](#)) and ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT, and the PIO Valid Lifetime to the lesser of the remaining valid lifetime and ND_VALID_LIMIT. Additionally, this document RECOMMENDS that the

Route Lifetime of Route Information Options (RIOs) [[RFC4191](#)], the Lifetime of Recursive DNS Search Options (RDNSO) [[RFC8106](#)], and the Lifetime of DNS Search List Options (DNSSL0) [[RFC8106](#)] be set to the lesser of the longest valid-lifetime in a DHCPv6 IA Prefix Option (received via DHCPv6 on the WAN-side) and ND_VALID_LIMIT, if any of these options are included in Router Advertisement messages.

This document RECOMMENDS that a CE Router providing stateful address configuration via DHCPv6 set the DHCPv6 IA Address Option preferred-lifetime to the lesser of the remaining preferred lifetime (see [Section 2.1](#)) and ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT, and the valid-lifetime of the same option to the lesser of the remaining valid lifetime and ND_VALID_LIMIT.

This document RECOMMENDS that a CE Router providing DHCPv6-PD on the LAN-side set the DHCPv6 IA Prefix Option preferred-lifetime to the lesser of the remaining preferred lifetime (see [Section 2.1](#)) and ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT, and the valid-lifetime of the same option to the lesser of the remaining valid lifetime and ND_VALID_LIMIT.

RATIONALE:

- * The Valid Lifetime and Preferred Lifetime of PIOs have direct impact on three different aspects:
 - + The amount of time hosts may end up employing stale network configuration information (see [[I-D.ietf-v6ops-slaac-renum](#)]).
 - + The amount of time CE Routers need to persist trying to deprecate stale network configuration information (e.g. to handle cases where nodes miss Router Advertisements and thus still consider the stale information as valid).
 - + The amount of information that a CE Routers need to maintain when e.g. multiple crash-and-reboot events occur in the timespan represented by the option lifetimes employed on the LAN-side.
- * CE Routers need not employ the (possibly long) DHCPv6-PD lifetimes for the Valid Lifetime and Preferred Lifetime of PIOs sent in Router Advertisements messages to advertise sub-prefixes of the leased prefix. Instead, CPE Routers SHOULD use shorter values for the Valid Lifetime and Preferred Lifetime of PIOs, since subsequent Router Advertisement messages will nevertheless refresh the associated lifetimes, leading to the same effective lifetimes as specified by the WAN-side DHCPv6-PD lifetimes.

- * Similarly, CE Routers need not employ the (possibly long) DHCPv6-PD lifetimes for the valid-lifetime and preferred-lifetime of IA Address Options and IA Prefix Option employed by DHCPv6 on the LAN-side, since the renewal of bindings by DHCPv6 clients will lead to the same effective lifetimes as specified by the WAN-side DHCPv6-PD lifetimes.

2.3. Signaling Stale Configuration Information

In order to phase-out stale SLAAC configuration information:

- o A CE router sending RAs that advertise dynamically-learned prefixes (e.g. via DHCPv6-PD) SHOULD record, on stable storage, the list of prefixes being advertised on each network segment, and the state of the "A" and "L" flags of the corresponding PIOs.
- o Upon changes to the advertised prefixes, and after bootstrapping, the CE router advertising prefix information via SLAAC SHOULD proceed as follows:
 - * Any prefixes that were previously advertised via Router Advertisement (RA) messages, but that have now become stale, MUST be advertised with a "Valid Lifetime" and a "Preferred Lifetime" set to 0, and the "A" and "L" bits unchanged.
 - * The aforementioned advertisement SHOULD be performed for at least the "Valid Lifetime" previously employed for such prefix. Note: If requirement L-16 ([Section 2.2](#)) is followed, the Valid Lifetime need not be saved and the prefix can simply be advertised for a period of ND_VALID_LIMIT.
- o CE Routers receiving DHCPv6 Prefix Delegations with a 0 valid-lifetime MUST advertise the corresponding sub-prefixes (as they would be generated for the same leased prefix with a non-zero lifetime) with a PIO with both the Preferred Lifetime and the Valid Lifetime set to 0, for at least the WAN-side DHCPv6-PD valid-lifetime, or for period of ND_VALID_LIMIT if the recommended lifetimes from [Section 2.2](#) are employed.

This document RECOMMENDS that if a CE Router provides LAN-side DHCPv6 (address assignment or prefix delegation), the following behavior be implemented:

- o The CE Router SHOULD record, on stable storage, the DHCPv6 address and delegated-prefix bindings corresponding to the LAN-side.
- o If the CE Router finds that the prefix to be employed for address assignment and/or prefix delegation has changed (e.g., upon a

crash-and-reboot event) or the CE Router receives DHCPv6 Prefix Delegations with 0 lifetimes, the CE Router MUST:

- * In Replies to DHCPv6 Request, Renew, Rebind messages, send 0 lifetimes for any address assignments or prefix delegations for the deprecated prefixes for at least the valid-lifetime previously employed for them, or for a period of ND_VALID_LIMIT if the recommended lifetimes from [Section 2.2](#) are employed.
- * Initiate sending Reconfigure messages (if possible - i.e., client requests Reconfigure support and the CE Router offers it) to the those clients with address assignments or prefix delegations for the deprecated prefixes.

RATIONALE:

- * IPv6 network renumbering is expected to take place in a planned manner, with old/stale prefixes being phased-out via reduced prefix lifetimes while new prefixes (with normal lifetimes) are introduced. However, there are a number of scenarios that may lead to the so-called "flash-renumbering" events, where the prefix being employed on a network suddenly becomes invalid and replaced by a new prefix [[I-D.ietf-v6ops-slaac-renum](#)]. One of such scenarios is that in which a DHCPv6 server employs dynamic prefixes, and the Customer Edge Router crashes and reboots. The requirements in this section are meant to allow Customer Edge Routers to deprecate stale information in such scenarios.
- * The recommendations in this section expand from requirement L-13 in [Section 4.3 of \[RFC7084\]](#).
- * Host configuring addresses via SLAAC on the local network may employ addresses configured for the previously advertised prefixes for at most the "Valid Lifetime" of the corresponding PIO of the last received Router Advertisement message. Since Router Advertisement messages may be lost or fail to be received for various reasons, Customer Edge Routers need to try to deprecate stale prefixes for a period of time equal to the "Valid Lifetime" of the PIO employed when originally advertising the prefix.
- * The requirement in this section is conveyed as a "SHOULD" (as opposed to a "MUST"), since we acknowledge that the requirement to store information on stable storage may represent a challenge for some implementations.

- * Advertising DHCPv6-leased prefixes with zero lifetimes on the LAN-side would handle the case where a CE Router has no stable storage but receives the prefixes via DHCPv6 with 0 lifetimes.

3. Recommended Option Lifetimes Configuration Values

- o ND_PREFERRED_LIMIT: 2700 seconds (45 minutes)
- o ND_VALID_LIMIT: 5400 seconds (90 minutes)

4. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

5. Security Considerations

This document discusses a problem that may arise in scenarios where dynamic IPv6 prefixes are employed, and proposes improvements to Customer Edge Routers [[RFC7084](#)] to mitigate the problem for residential or small office scenarios. It does not introduce new security issues.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Owen DeLong, Philip Homburg, and Ted Lemon, for their valuable help in improving this document via successive detailed reviews.

The authors would like to thank Mikael Abrahamsson, Brian Carpenter, Lorenzo Colitti, Alejandro D'Egidio, Fernando Frediani, Erik Kline, Olorunloba Olopade, Mark Smith, Job Snijders, Sander Steffann, Ole Troan, Loganaden Velvindron, Timothy Winters, and Chongfeng Xie, for providing valuable comments on earlier versions of this document.

The authors would like to thank Mikael Abrahamsson, Luis Balbinot, Tim Chown, Brian Carpenter, Owen DeLong, Gert Doering, Steinar Haug, Nick Hilliard, Philip Homburg, Lee Howard, Christian Huitema, Ted Lemon, Albert Manfredi, Jordi Palet Martinez, Richard Patterson, Michael Richardson, Mark Smith, Job Snijders, Tarko Tikan, and Ole Troan, for providing valuable comments on [[I-D.gont-6man-slaac-renum](#)], on which this document is based.

Fernando would also like to thank Brian Carpenter who, over the years, has answered many questions and provided valuable comments that has benefited his protocol-related work.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC4191] Draves, R. and D. Thaler, "Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes", [RFC 4191](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4191, November 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4191>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC7772] Yourtchenko, A. and L. Colitti, "Reducing Energy Consumption of Router Advertisements", [BCP 202](#), [RFC 7772](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7772, February 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7772>>.
- [RFC8106] Jeong, J., Park, S., Beloeil, L., and S. Madanapalli, "IPv6 Router Advertisement Options for DNS Configuration", [RFC 8106](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8106, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8106>>.
- [RFC8415] Mrugalski, T., Siodelski, M., Volz, B., Yourtchenko, A., Richardson, M., Jiang, S., Lemon, T., and T. Winters, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", [RFC 8415](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8415, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8415>>.

7.2. Informative References

- [I-D.gont-6man-slaac-renum]
Gont, F., Zorz, J., and R. Patterson, "Improving the Robustness of Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC) to Flash Renumbering Events", [draft-gont-6man-slaac-renum-07](#) (work in progress), April 2020.
- [I-D.ietf-v6ops-slaac-renum]
Gont, F., Zorz, J., and R. Patterson, "Reaction of Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC) to Flash-Renumbering Events", [draft-ietf-v6ops-slaac-renum-02](#) (work in progress), May 2020.

[RFC7084] Singh, H., Beebee, W., Donley, C., and B. Stark, "Basic Requirements for IPv6 Customer Edge Routers", [RFC 7084](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7084, November 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7084>>.

Authors' Addresses

Fernando Gont
SI6 Networks
Segurola y Habana 4310, 7mo Piso
Villa Devoto, Ciudad Autonoma de Buenos Aires
Argentina

Email: fgont@si6networks.com
URI: <https://www.si6networks.com>

Jan Zorz
Go6 Institute
Frankovo naselje 165
Skofja Loka 4220
Slovenia

Email: jan@go6.si
URI: <https://www.go6.si>

Richard Patterson
Sky UK

Email: richard.patterson@sky.uk

Bernie Volz
Cisco Systems, Inc.
1414 Massachusetts Ave
Boxborough, MA 01719
USA

Email: volz@cisco.com

