Gap Analysis, Problem Statement and Requirements for Source Address Validation in Intra-domain Networks

Presenter: Lancheng Qin

Nov, 2025

WG Discussions

- Split the document into two documents or not?
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/ocYBf3XrrmXm1LPyqRUmo9ZsyOo/
- Intra-domain SAV deployment locations
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/KnJG_HY44R4k8VFg-4Y1UhjHmD0/
- The definition of intra-domain sub-network
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/D_Jh3k9dUSrv51C8g8FrqDC9Ty0/
- Wording suggestions for intra-domain sub-network
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/jR7ovb0y2arxPm3j73K-tHa1nJY/
- Which document handles non-BGP customers
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/JgZYkLWt6FF3JFNjRcEXbUFR5Qw/
- The definition of intra-domain hidden prefixes
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/sdzsZlv714xz6QnRZV_4GAlYozo/

WG Discussion #1

- Discussion: Split the document into two documents or not?

- WG consensus
  - **Do not split** the document into two documents
  - Clarify in Section 5 that **"These informational requirements cannot be used to initiate standards-track protocol changes."**
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/d8KXU325BxB45OXD_hqc4ggQeLo/

WG Discussion #2

- Discussion: Intra-domain SAV deployment locations

- WG consensus

  - The clear conclusion (i.e. WG rough consensus) is that the WG chooses to **focus on edge deployments (i.e., SAV at external interfaces)**

  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/jGeQ-JMdhT_GvZmVk4pZy0ZMhds/

WG Discussion #3

- Discussion: The definition of intra-domain sub-network

- Clarification on mailing list

  - The term sub-network is intended to refer to a non-BGP customer. The idea is to capture scenarios where the customer network does not run BGP, and SAV is applied at the boundary between the operator and such a customer network

WG Discussion #4

- Discussion: Wording suggestions for intra-domain sub-network
- Final decision according to mailing list discussion
  - Replace the term sub-network with non-BGP customer network

WG Discussion #5

- Discussion: Which document handles non-BGP customers

- Final decision according to mailing list discussion
  - It's intra-domain because it requires information that does not come from BGP

WG Discussion #6

- Discussion: The definition of intra-domain hidden prefixes
- Clarification on mailing list
  - The intra-domain hidden prefix scenario actually refers to:
    - A host that sources traffic with an address not allocated by the operator (for example, the host can be a cloud server instance operated by a tenant), or
    - A non-BGP customer that sources traffic with an address not advertised to the operator.
  - The key challenge here is how to provide authoritative information to authorize the host or non-BGP customer to use such source addresses

Main Updates

1. Clarified that this document **focuses on intra-domain SAV deployment at external interfaces**, while SAV at internal interfaces is considered out of scope **(based on WG consensus)**
2. **Replaced the term sub-network with non-BGP customer network** and **clarified its definition** in the terminology section **(based on mailing list discussions)**
3. **Refined the description of the intra-domain hidden prefix** scenario in Section 3.1.2 **(based on mailing list discussions)**
4. Added a discussion in Section 4 on the potential for incorrect routing information **(based on mailing list discussions)**
5. Clarified in Section 5 that "**These informational requirements cannot be used to initiate standards-track protocol changes.**" to address the AD's concern **(based on WG consensus)**
6. Clarified and distinguished incremental deployment and incremental benefits in Section 5.3.
7. Removed references that were not cited in the main text and corrected some wording issues **(based on the shepherd's review)**

Shepherd Review and Chair Decision

- Shepherd Review
  - The shepherd is **fine with the updates**
    - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/GQrv6AnVnFZk9fIbXKemHOv01cA/
- Chair Decision
  - The chairs hope to be able to **reissue the WG last call in the near future**
    - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/savnet/ho2sajOzZLw_Y_I4k5Df-gE4ipc/

Next Step

- Reissue the WGLC ?