status report

< draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-ps-01.txt,
draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-req-02.txt >

Arifumi Matsumoto, Tomohiro Fujisaki(NTT-PF-Lab)
Kenichi Kanayama, Ruri Hiromi(Intec NetCore)

Problem Statement(1/3)

draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-ps-01.txt

- From Zhang, Shinsuke

- Editorial comments

  - correct typography in section 1

  - replace to the easy-to-understand word, on "false dropping of the address selection"

  - 2.1.2, 2.1.4, update reference RFC no.

Problem Statement(2/3)

draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-ps-01.txt

- Technical comments

  - almost seems to be fine, but

  - 1.1, assumed to describe difference between "multi-prefix" and "multi-homing", because it is confusing what we focused on.

  - 2.1.4, need to be accurate with "2000::/3 ends in 2-3 years", replace to the appropriate words

Problem Statement(3/3)

draft-ietf-v6ops-addr-select-ps-01.txt

- Technical Comment(cont'd)

  - 2.1.5, this problem must be solved with "preferred-lifetime=0", put additional information

  - 2.1.6, not only for "local/global" but also for "public/temporary", add these words

  - 2.2.2, should add precondition of "able to access internet without proxy", also add

Selection Requirement(1/4)

draft-ietf-v6opps-addr-select-req-02.txt

- Comments from Brian, Shinsuke

- Editorial Comment

  - correct several typography

Selection Requirement(2/4)

draft-ietf-v6opps-addr-select-req-02.txt

- Technical comment

  - should describe classification by necessity of configuability

  - should describe label by "how much require it"

  - --> those 2 are not necessary?

  - replace 2.8(next hop selection) as Arifumi already told in the mailing list

Selection Requirement(3/4)

- Technical comment(cont'd)

  - 3, assumed to describe security influence from this requirement might occur

    - i.e, DoS attacks from frequent Dynamic Updates; Session hijacking by untrusted central controllers; DoS attacks caused by illegally synchronized routing table & policy table, and so on

Selection Requirement(4/4)

draft-ietf-v6opps-addr-select-req-02.txt

- Comment from SECDIR

  - should add more detailed analysis on threats what this requirement will be brought to.

  - need for checking the additional description sending to the mailing list

conclusion

- welcome further comment!

- update 2 drafts a.s.a.p after this meeting

  - do we complete problem statement?

  - does it needed to be re-checking about security things on requirement draft?