Stub Network
AutoConfiguration
Problem Statement

• Hosts can connect to network infrastructure link automatically
  • infrastructure example: home WiFi network
• No similar way to connect a stub network to network infrastructure link, so that:
  • Hosts on stub network can reach hosts on infrastructure link
  • Hosts on infrastructure can reach hosts on stub net
  • Hosts on stub net can discover services on infrastructure link
  • Hosts on infrastructure can discover services on stub net
• Goal:
  • Connect a stub network to a network giving hosts on stub network the same experience as hosts on infrastructure
Popular non-solution

- The usual non-solution is to have a double NAT
- This has problems:
  - Devices on inner link can reach devices on outer link
  - Devices on outer link can’t reach devices on inner link
  - Devices on inner link can’t discover devices on outer link
  - Devices on outer link can’t discover devices on inner link
  - Devices on both links can reach internet
  - So you’re stuck with cloud-only solutions
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Goals

• Primary goals
  • Mutual reachability between stub hosts and infra hosts
  • Mutual discoverability between stub hosts and infra hosts
  • Stub hosts can reach services on the internet (firmware updates!)

• Stretch goals:
  • Hosts on stub networks can mutually communicate with
    hosts on non-adjacent links, within an administrative
    domain or the internet
  • Hosts on stub networks are discoverable on non-adjacent
    infrastructure links, or possibly on the internet
Constraints

• This has to work with existing networks:
  • We can’t require changes to people’s home routers, for example
  • We can’t require changes to infrastructure hosts
• Stub networks might be green-field or ordinary
  • Green-field example: constrained network that doesn’t currently provide IP routing
    • In this case we can require changes to hosts
  • Ordinary example: like the double NAT, but without the limitations
    • In this case, we can’t require changes to hosts
Topology constraints

• Stub networks are not transit networks:
  • we don’t want or need routing across stub networks
• Stub networks may be multiply connected:
  • more than one stub network router connected to same stub network
  • stub routers connected to one stub network may be connected to different infrastructure links
  • Not clear we can support this, and if so how we would support it
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Assumptions

- Based on analysis in draft-lemon-stub-networks-ps
  - Use IPv6
  - Use routing
  - Use DNS Service Discovery
- Are these assumptions controversial?
Service Discovery

- Current home networks use multicast DNS for service discovery
- This is widely deployed, and widely supported:
  - Linux
  - Android
  - Apple iOS, MacOS, etc.
  - Windows
- Other alternatives?
Deliverables

- A document that describes how to address the initial goals
  - e.g., draft-lemon-stub-networks
- Additional documents required to address stretch goals, e.g.
  - DHCPv6 PD to acquire stub network on-link prefix
  - How to include stub network DNSSD in an infrastructure-provided DNSSD service