

RFC 6724 update

**(aka. Prioritizing known-local IPv6 ULAs through
address selection policy)**

draft-ietf-6man-rfc6724-update-15

Nick Buraglio (ESnet), **Tim Chown (Jisc)**, Jeremy Duncan (Tachyon Dynamics)
6man, IETF 121, Dublin, 7 November 2024

Key changes during recent WGLC

Section 5.3 now says: “2. RIOs within fd00::/8 that are **of length /40 or longer** MUST be added to the known-local ULA list. RIOs for shorter prefixes MUST NOT be used to insert known-local ULA entries in the address selection policy table”

Text added to set the context for the /40 compromise (whether a 4193-bis is opened to change the Global ID there from 40 bits to 32-40 bits is an open question)

Section 5.2: now says “an IPv6 implementation will need to remember which next-hops advertised which prefixes [RFC8028]”

Stated that the known-local approach only applies to fd00::/8, thus fc00::/8 is undefined

Made an edit pass to clarify the text to be consistent for the final consensus, including a rewritten more concise abstract

Questions / comments ?