

# Discovering Provisioning Domain Names and Data

draft-ietf-intarea-provisioning-domains-02

P. Pfister, **E. Vyncke**, T. Pauly, D. Schinazi, W. Shao

**IETF-103, Bangkok, November 2018**

# News

- -02 presented to V6OPS at IETF-102
- Is now referenced by
  - draft-ietf-homenet-simple-naming-03 (section 6.5)
  - draft-pref64folks-6man-ra-pref64 (section 6)
- -03 released (see after)

# Changes in -03

- Clarify that multiple RA can be sent when RA options > MTU and how it impacts the PvD Option
- Section 3.4.3 “Connection sharing by the host” has a lot of text clarifications (at Erik Kline’s suggestion)

# Connection sharing by the host (update)/1

- Some explanations & references about tethering techniques

Whenever the RAs received from the upstream interface contain a PVD RA option, hosts that are sharing connectivity SHOULD include a PVD Option within the RAs sent downstream with:

- The same PVD-ID FQDN.
- The same H-bit, Delay and Sequence Number values.
- The L bit set whenever the host **is sharing IPv4** connectivity received from the same upstream interface.
- The bits from the Reserved field set to 0.

# Connection sharing by the host (update)/2

The values of the R-bit, Router Advertisement message header and Options field depend on *whether the connectivity should be shared only with PvD aware hosts or not* (see Section 3.2). In particular, all options received within the upstream PvD option and included in the downstream RA SHOULD be included in the downstream PvD option.

Ted Lemon and Alexandre Petrescu want clarification on the blue sentences, authors will need to clarify by using different use cases:

- Operator wants to share connectivity only with PvD-aware hosts
- IPv4 connectivity is shared

# Next steps

- Issue a -04
  - new author's address,
  - clarification cfr previous slide
- Review by 6MAN is still to be requested
- Then go WGLC