



IPv6 Extension Headers

draft-ietf-6man-exthdr-04.txt

Suresh Krishnan, Ericsson

James Woodyatt, Apple

Erik Kline, Google

James Hoagland, Symantec

Manav Bhatia, Alcatel-Lucent

Goals of the draft

- › Recommends the use of destination options as the **preferred mechanism** for extending IPv6
- › Strongly **recommends against** creation of new extension headers
 - Allows creation of new extension headers if there is a very strong case as to why other mechanisms were not usable
- › Defines a standard format for extension headers to allow any new extension headers to minimize breakage on current hardware.

Contradiction?

- › Some people contend that the draft contradicts itself
 - It does not (at least not intentionally 😊)
 - The bottom line is
 - › “Don’t create new extension headers, but if there is no other alternative create them in THIS uniform format to minimize breakage”

Z]`
§ @*«~@~>
«øU0U0Yь
aAaаCсCсC
NnNnOoOoE
ZzZzZz f f\$§“
и
GGGGllllkk
TTT000UU
»XΨÿAЕНI
НОПРСТУФ
ОПРСТУФХ
ЪѐѐVvГгѐ

Next Steps

- › Draft has completed WGLC
 - Thanks to everyone who commented
- › All open issues have been resolved
 - The draft will end up updating RFC2460, as RFC2460 recommended extension headers on the same footing as destination options (for a given error/drop behavior)
- › Advance to the IESG?

z]`
§ @*~@~>
k0U0U0Yb
aAaaCcCcC
NpNnO0o0E
ZzZzZzJjSs"
m
GGGGllllkk
TTT00000
xψÿαєи
нОПРСТУФ
ОПРСТУФХ
ЪѢѤѦѧѨ



ERICSSON