draft-ietf-softwire-map

Summary of post WGLC review and comments
otroan@employees.org

Reviews:

- AD review – Ted Lemon
  - Language fixes. Add reference to DNS Proxy. (in -11)
  - **Raise the issue of SHOULD vs MUST for rewriting IP id space to match PSID**
- IETF Last Call
  - No comments
- OpsDir review – Fred Baker
  - "Mostly Ready" or "Ready with nits".
  - What does it mean for the "basic" or "forwarding" mapping rules to be mandatory or optional? (Clarified in -11)
- SecDir review
  - Asks for reference to address dependent filtering (to go in -12)
  - Worried about guarantee against overlapping mappings (to go in 12)
- Gen-Art – Francis Dupont
  - Ready
  - Spelling mistakes (British->American), abbreviations expansions (in revision -11)
- IANA review
  - No action

Frag id issue (for -12)

- Rewriting IP identifiers. Balancing risk of creating more fragmentation collisions on a single connection vs risk of collisions from multiple sources (from same address) to single destination.

"If two IPv4 host behind two different MAP CE's with the same IPv4 address sends fragments to an IPv4 destination host outside the domain, those hosts may use the same IPv4 fragmentation identifier, resulting in incorrect reassembly of the fragments at the destination host. Given that the IPv4 fragmentation identifier is a 16 bit field, it could be used similarly to port ranges. A MAP CE could rewrite the IPv4 fragmentation identifier to be within its allocated port-set, if the resulting fragment identifier space was large enough related to the rate fragments was sent. However, splitting the identifier space in this fashion would increase the probability of reassembly collision for all connections through the CPE. See also RFC6864."

Other issues raised

- Section 5.1 bug raised by Lei Yan – to be fixed in -12.

IESG status

- 1 Yes, 9 No objection, 2 Abstain, 2 No record
- Multiple comments:
  - Lack of recommendation of port set size
  - **I wish more effort had gone into reducing the options**
- DISCUSS held by Kathleen Moriarty
  - Held based on SecDir review.
  - Tom responded and we're awaiting Kathleen's acceptable of response
    - Essentially state that the algorithm generates non-overlapping port-sets as long as the underlying material is correct

Summary

- Await resolution of IESG DISCUSS
- Publish rev -12
- Done