

# Problem Statement of Default Use Of RFC3484 Rules and Requirements for policy distribution #2

**draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-ps**  
**draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-req**

(NTT PF Lab.) Arifumi Matsumoto

Tomohiro Fujisaki

(Intec NetCore, Inc.) Kenichi Kanayama

Ruri Hiromi

# updates from previous version

- for problem statement draft
    - no additional comments from WG
  - for requirements draft
    - Targeted for wider scope than that of RFC 3484
      - *Requirements for distributing RFC3484 address selection policy*
- 
- *Requirements for the address selection mechanisms*
  - Added some requirements discussed at San Diego

# Revised requirements

1. The mechanism can modify RFC 3484 default address selection behavior.
2. Timing: Nodes can get address selection information when it is necessary.
3. Address selection behavior at nodes can be dynamically updated.
4. The mechanism can support host-specific address selection.
5. Application specific policy is supported.
  - This can be achieved In a combination with APIs.
6. Multiple I/Fs cases should be considered.
7. Node's address selection behavior can be centrally controlled.



# Possible Approaches for Address Selection Problem

- **Proactive Approach**
  - **Deliver Everything Needed At Once Approach**
    - E.g. A host acquires RFC 3484 Policy Table
  - **A Question and An Answer Approach**
    - A host asks an Agent Server(e.g. a router) “which of my addresses is the best for a destination ?”
- **Reactive Approach**
  - **Try-and-Error Approach**
    - An ICMP Error notifies the host of address mal-selection and the host stores cache in case for the next try.
  - **All by Oneself Approach**
    - Shim6: A host performs failure detection and address cycling

static



dynamic



# Proactive Approach 1/2

## “Deliver Everything Needed At Once Approach”

- **Advantages** and **Disadvantages**
  - Per-connection overhead time can be minimized.
  - Traffic volume = #of policies \* # of hosts in the network.
  - **Hosts and Servers need to have this function support.**
  - **In a dynamically changing network traffic increases.**
- E.g. “RFC 3484 Policy Table Delivery by DHCPv6”
  - draft-fujisaki-dhc-addr-select-opt-03.txt
  - OS needs no change if it has RFC 3484 Policy Table.
  - Both Dst. and src. address selections are supported.
  - **Policies beyond Policy Table capability are not supported.**
  - **DHCPv6 isn't suitable for frequent information update.**

# Proactive Approach 2/2

## “A Question and An Answer Approach”

- **Advantages and Disadvantages**
  - Dynamically changing network status is easily reflected.
  - Both Dst. and src. address selections are supported.
  - Per-connection overhead process and time.
  - Host implementation needs a big change.
  - Every application also has to be modified.
    - Today, dst address selection at App, src at kernel.
- E.g. “Address Selection Agent Server”
  - No concrete specification yet.

# Reactive Approach 1/2

## “Try-and-Error Approach”

- An ICMP Error notifies the host of address mal-selection.
- The host stores cache in case for the next try.
- **Advantages** and **Disadvantages**
  - Can reflect dynamically changing routing status if cache lifetime works nicely.
  - Per destination host cache can be so big.
  - Host and Router needs to be changed.
  - There is not enough experience about this cache mechanism.
  - The user has to wait before finding working address pair.
- E.g. RFC3484-update by M. Bagnulo

# Reactive Approach 2/2

## “All by Oneself Approach”

- A host performs failure detection and address cycling
- E.g. Shim6
- **Advantages and Disadvantages**
  - Dynamic network failures between E2E can be reflected to address selection.
  - A session survivability supported.
  - No router modification needed.
  - The host implementation has to be changed significantly.
  - A User has to wait before finding working address pair. (?)
  - A host stores address selection cache per host.
  - Site address selection policy(TE) cannot be reflected. (?)

