Current state of the draft

- WGLC expired September 28
- Still appears to be broad support
- Made minor changes and uploaded -02
Feedback from WGLC

- Lots of support and suggestions for clarifying the text - thanks!
- Individual WG member concerns:
  - /64 per host excessive?
    - Addressed by noting that /64 cannot be further subdivided [RFC7421]. Also, draft only recommends /64 for general purpose hosts when SLAAC is not in use
  - Use cases for multiple addresses are weak and recommendation is one-size fits all
    - Authors feel that the draft provides sufficient motivation, and recommendation is appropriate because scoped to general-purpose hosts
  - Should provide more clarification that per-IP-address charging model is bad
    - Draft already addresses this; not much we can do beyond saying it’s ineffective. Also, per-device charging is not the only issue
  - Should make a stronger case why on-demand address allocation is undesirable
    - Draft already addresses this in some detail
(Minor) Changes since -01

● Added text to further justify recommendation for /64 per host
  ○ “If the prefix is a /64, it can be extended via L2 bridging, ND proxying or /64 sharing, but it cannot be further subdivided, as a prefix longer than /64 is outside the current IPv6 specifications.”

● “Smaller prefix” -> “longer prefix”

● Documented assertions on university networks using tracking with SLAAC

● Minor clarifications, reworded some of the text, fixed spelling errors
Next steps

● IETF last call?