Considerations of Using Unique Local Addresses

(draft-ietf-v6ops-ula-usage-recommendations-03)

Brian Carpenter (Speaker)

Bing Liu, Sheng Jiang

IETF 90@Toronto, July 2014

Topics discussed since last IETF

- #1 Title and keywords change
- #2 Isolated networks relevant
- #3 ULA+NPTv6
- #4 Site-local addresses reference
- #5 ULA default routing considerations

All the topics appeared to reach rough consensus in the mailing list and were reflected in current version of draft.

Main Revision #1:
Title and Keywords

- Title change: "~~**Recommendations**~~ **Considerations of Using Unique Local Addresses** ~~**Usages**~~"
- Key words of "recommendations" and "guidance" in the main body were also replaced by "considerations"

Main Revision #2: Isolated networks relevant description

- Clearly states that isolated networks might be connected in the future.
- A brief consideration of when it gets connected
  - ULA prefix collision issue when connects to another ULA based isolated/private network. (However, the collision possibility is extremely low if ULAs are generated by the standard way.)
  - Address selection issue between ULAs and GUAs when connects to the global Internet.

Main Revision #3: NAT relevant description

- Clearly NOT recommend to use ULA +NPTv6
  - "this document does not recommend the use of ULA+NPTv6. Rather, this document considers ULA+PA (Provider Aggregated) as a better approach to connect to the global network when ULAs are expected to be retained." *(Quoted from Section 4.2.1)*

Main Revision #4: Referencing Site-Local Addresses

- A brief statement in “Introduction”
  - “Since site-local addresses are deprecated in [RFC3879], ULAs could be alternatives of site-local addresses in some situations (but they are not equal).”
- ULA alternative of site-local based anycast addresses
  - The comment suggesting to discuss this topic was NOT included in this draft.
  - A dedicated draft for this topic would be better.

Main Revision #5: Quoted ULA default routing considerations

- Quoted from [RFC7084] (Basic Requirements for IPv6 Customer Edge Routers)
  - Rule ULA-5: "An IPv6 CE router MUST NOT advertise itself as a default router with a Router Lifetime greater than zero whenever all of its configured and delegated prefixes are ULA prefixes."
  - Rule L-3: "An IPv6 CE router MUST advertise itself as a router for the delegated prefix(es) (and ULA prefix if configured to provide ULA addressing) using the 'Route Information Option' specified in Section 2.3 of [RFC4191]. "

Main Revision #Editorial

- Added a new Section 2 "Requirements Language“
- Other wording revisions, including updating the References and Acknowledgements

Comments?
Ready for WGLC?

Thank you!

IETF90@Toronto