

# Update to RFC 3484 Default Address Selection for IPv6

draft-ietf-6man-rfc3484-revise-04  
draft-ietf-6man-addr-select-opt-01

Tim Chown (\*)  
Arifumi Matsumoto  
Jun-ya Kato  
Tomohiro Fujisaki

# Status update

- draft-ietf-6man-rfc3484-revise-04.txt
  - 3 remaining issues before WGLC.
  - Through discussion at ML, 3 issues almost closed.
- draft-ietf-6man-addr-select-opt-01
  - Needs dhc wg review before WGLC at 6man.
  - Requested 5 min slot for dhc on Thursday.

# RFC3484-revise Issue #1

- **Deprecated prefixes in the policy table ?**
  - 3ffe::/16 for 6bone testbed
  - fec0::/10 for site-local addresses
  - ::/96 for IPv4-compatible IPv6 addresses
- **Proposal**
  - They should be kept in the policy table to avoid bad effects since their re-use is not expected. The above prefixes all should be kept.
    - Per RFC3701, 6bone prefixes are not to be used on the Internet in any form now.
    - Site-local prefixes are prohibited from reassignment.
    - IPv4-compatible IPv6 address are deprecated.

# RFC3484-revise Issue #2

- **Support preference for privacy extension usage in RFC3484-bis ?**
  - A configuration switch for privacy extensions somewhere, e.g. the policy table ?
- **Comments**
  - RFC5014 provides applications a way to switch.
- **Conclusion**
  - Not enough interest. Suggestion for RA-based privacy toggle not well received. So leave as is.

# RFC3484-revise Issue #3

- **Prefer greatest prefix lifetime ?**
  - Mark Smith proposed this rule to prioritize manually configured addresses over SLAAC addresses.
- **Proposal**
  - In concept, address lifetime should be independent from address selection as far as it has non-zero value.
  - Whether a ‘Prefer static addresses’ rule should exist between rules 3 and 4 is a separate question.
  - Leave as is.

# Conclusions

- draft-ietf-6man-rfc3484-revise-04
  - Can the 3 issues be concluded in the proposed ways ?
  - If so, can WGLC begin now ?
- draft-ietf-6man-addr-select-opt-01
  - WGLC should begin after dhc wg review ?