

**Things MULTI6 Developers should think about
draft-lear-multi6-things-to-think-about-00**

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>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on June 10, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document specifies a set of questions that authors should be prepared to answer as part of a solution to multihoming with IPv6. The questions do not assume that multihoming is the only problem of interest, nor do they demand a more general solution either.

1. Introduction

At the time of this writing there are some six separate solutions looking at the problem of multihoming within IPv6 and related problems, such as the locator/identifier split.

In order to sort through how proposed solutions compare against one another, and potentially, how they can borrow mechanisms and design decisions from one another, this document contains a list of pointed questions.

This document contains only some useful questions. There are others that should be added. If you know of one, please email the author, as he has assuredly missed many.

Unless it is blatantly obvious, each question contains some reasoning as to why it is being asked. It is envisioned that no solution will answer every question with completeness, but that there will be tradeoffs to be made. The answers by the various designers of solutions will hopefully shed some light on which tradeoffs we as a community wish to make.

It would seem silly for people who have written out detailed answers to these questions to have to repeat the exercise. Therefore, a simple reference to existing documents will suffice, so long as the answer is complete. If it is not complete, then feel free to reference it and add what text is necessary to make the answer complete.

This document presumes a familiarity with [RFC 3582](#) [2], and does not attempt to repeat the requirements work gathered there.

2. The Questions

2.1 Routing

2.1.1 How will your solution solve the multihoming problem?

That's why we're here. Remember, a reference is fine.

2.1.2 Uniqueness

2.1.2.1 Does your solution address mobility?

If so, how are rendezvous handled? Can your solution handle both locators changing at the same time? Should it? If not, how will your solution interact with MOBILEIP-V6 [3] (MIPv6)

2.2 Identifiers and locators

2.2.1 Does your solution provide for a split between identifiers and locators?

2.2.2 What is the lifetime of a binding from an identifier to a locator?

2.2.3 How is the binding updated?

Will transport connections remain up?

2.3 On The Wire

2.3.1 At what layer is your solution applied, and how?

Is it applied in every packet? If so, what fields are used?

2.3.2 Why is the layer you chose the correct one?

Each layer has its benefits and tradeoffs. For instance, transport layer solutions would require that EVERY transport be modified, while IP layer solutions may entail expansion of the packet or a change to the pseudo-header (thus requiring changes to the transport layer).

2.3.3 Does your solution expand the size of an IP packet?

Expanding the size of an IP packet may cause excessive fragmentation in some circumstances.

2.3.4 Do you change the way fragmenting is handled?

If you use a shim approach, do you fragment above or below the shim?

How are fragments identified, so that they can be reassembled? If you use any additional names, do they need to be associated with fragments? If not, why not? If so, how will that happen?

2.3.5 Are there any changes to ICMP error semantics?

Do you create new codes? If so, why and what do they mean? Will a host that is not aware of your scheme see them?

2.4 Names, Hosts, Endpoints, or none of the above?

2.4.1 Please explain the relationship of your solution to DNS

If your solution uses new names for identifiers, please explain what mappings are defined, and how they are performed?

If there are any additional administrative requirements, such as new zones or RR types to manage, please explain them as well.

2.4.2 Please explain interactions with "2-faced" DNS

2-faced DNS is used so that hosts behind a NAT get one address for internal hosts, while hosts outside the NAT get another. Similar mechanisms are used for application layer gateways, such as SOCKS [5].

2.4.3 Does your solution require centralized registration?

For instance, if you are using the DNS, what will be the top level domain, and how will the name space distribute through it?

Also, how will the centralized registration be managed?

2.4.4 Have you checked for DNS circular dependencies?

If you are using the DNS in your solution, is it required for connectivity? What happens if the DNS fails? Can communication between the DNS resolver and the server make use of your solution? What about between the application and the resolver?

2.4.5 What if a DNS server itself is multihomed?

If a link fails or a service is dropped, how will it impact DNS? Again are there any dependency loops? Perhaps diagram out your dependencies to make sure.

2.4.6 What application/API changes are needed?

Will old code just work with the new mechanism?

2.4.7 Is this solution backward compatible with "old" IP version 6?

Can it be deployed incrementally? Please describe how.

Does your solution impose requirements on non-multihomed/non-mobile hosts?

2.4.8 Is your solution backward compatible with IPv4?

How will your mechanism interact with 6to4 gateways and IPv4 hosts?

2.4.9 How will your solution interact with other middleboxes?

What are the implications for firewalls? What are the interactions with NAT? What are the interactions with web caches? What complications are introduced with your solution?

2.4.10 Are there any implications for scoped addressing?

Please see [RFC 3513](#) [1]. How does your mechanism interact with multicast?

How does your solution interact with link-local addressing

How does your solution interact with Son-Of-Sitelocal (whatever that will be)?

2.4.11 Are there any layer 2 implications to your proposal?

While Ipv6 has a simplified approach to layer 2, perhaps you unsimplified it. If so, please provide details.

2.4.12 Referrals

How will your solution handle referrals, such as those within FTP?

It must be possible for existing applications to continue to work. Referrals exist within various other protocols, such as so-called "peer to peer" applications.

2.5 Legal Stuff

Are you introducing a namespace that might involve mnemonics? Doing so might introduce trademark concerns. If so, how do you plan to address such concerns?

Are there any organizations required to manage a new name space? If so, please describe what they are and how the method will scale.

3. Security Considerations

How secure should a multi6 solution be? This is a reasonable question for each solution to answer. The author opines that the worst case should be no worse than what we have today. However, any additional risks should be clearly stated by the authors. Considerable time should be spent on threat analysis. Please see [\[4\]](#) for more details.

4. Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge everyone in the multi6 group and elsewhere that is putting forward proposals. It is easy to ask questions like the ones found in this draft. It is quite a bit harder to develop running code to answer them.

Normative References

- [1] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Addressing Architecture", [RFC 3513](#), April 2003.
- [2] Abley, J., Black, B. and V. Gill, "Goals for IPv6 Site-Multihoming Architectures", [RFC 3582](#), August 2003.
- [3] Johnson, D., Perkins, C. and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [draft-ietf-mobileip-ipv6-24](#) (work in progress), July 2003.
- [4] Nordmark, E. and T. Li, "Threats relating to IPv6 multihoming solutions", [draft-nordmark-multi6-threats-00](#) (work in progress), October 2003.

Informative References

- [5] Kitamura, H., "A SOCKS-based IPv6/IPv4 Gateway Mechanism", [RFC 3089](#), April 2001.

Author's Address

Eliot Lear
Cisco Systems
170 W. Tasman Dr.
San Jose, CA 95134-1706
US

EMail: lear@cisco.com

Intellectual Property Statement

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 of the 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 implementors 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.

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). 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.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the
Internet Society.