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Background

- RFC 3633 prohibits assignment of any of the delegated prefixes to the upstream interface of the requesting router
- This is an issue for deployments where:
  - Unnumbered model is not used
  - Delegated prefixes must be aggregatable with the prefix used in requesting router’s upstream interface:
    - Routing efficiency
    - Policy control easier if single prefix / client
  - “Wasting” prefixes is a concern
Existing Solutions

1. Delegating prefixes in small blocks
   - Lots of prefix sets, but very little waste

2. DR delegates only half of the reserved prefix to the requesting router
   - Wasting ~half of the addresses

3. Non-aggregatable prefixes
   - Increased complexity (e.g. double routes)

4. Unnumbered model
   - Strong no go in some architectures
Proposed Solution – Exclude specific prefix(es)

- New IAprefix option for OPTION_IAPREFIX (RFC3633):
  - OPTION_PD_EXCLUDE
  - Defines a hole in the delegated prefix
- Modified RR indicates support for the new option
- Modified DR uses optimization when possible
  - Otherwise may use e.g. the "waste half" approach
Example (3GPP minded)

- Requesting Router (e.g. a mobile device) is first allocated /64 for its uplink interface with SLAAC
- Requesting Router informs Delegating Router about support for OPTION_PD_EXCLUDE and includes the /64 obtained from SLAAC (may help DR in its decision making, also for reliability)
- DR replies with delegated prefix & cuts a piece away
  - Ensures the prefix told by RR is not part of delegated prefix
  - May cut larger piece than single /64
Summary

• Optional optimization for prefix delegation for certain network architectures
  • Other SDOs / deployments may mandate support
• Feature introduced as an option for OPTION_IAPREFIX
• Backwards compatible for both RR and DR

DHC WG to adopt this piece of work?
Feedback?
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