

DHCPv6 Prefix-Length Hint Issues Update

draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-prefix-length-hint-issue-02

IETF96 DHC WG

Document status

- Currently an active WG document
- First presented in IETF93, received substantial reviews & comments
- Made a few updates after the last IETF meeting, according to mailing list discussions

Updates since IETF95

- Problem
 - If client requests for 2001::/60 in Solicit
 - Does it imply that the client is willing to accept another ::/60 prefix if 2001::/60 is not available?
- Solution
 - If client is willing to accept another prefix when the requested prefix is not available, it SHOULD include a prefix-length hint in Solicit
 - E.g. 2001::/60
::/60

Updates since IETF95

- Problem
 - Should the client send a hint if it has a *wider* prefix assigned than it needs?
- Solution
 - Client SHOULD include a hint in Solicit and Rebind
 - But not in Renew to avoid renumbering

Updates since IETF95

- Problem
 - Document type: Informational or Standards Track?
 - Several discussions on mailing list
 - Most in favor of Standards Track
- Solution
 - We added normative language into the solution sections of the draft
 - Changed document type to Standards Track

Use of Normative language

- Solution sections
 - Use “SHOULD” to regulate Client/Server behavior in each DHCPv6 message
 - Client **SHOULD** include prefix-length hint when...
 - Upon receiving the prefix-length hint the server **SHOULD**...
 - Use “MUST” to regulate client behavior to avoid failure
 - Client **MUST** neglect Advertise messages containing prefixes which it can't use
 - Client **MUST** resend Solicit at defined intervals, as specified in RFC7083

Next step

- Updated newest version on June 19th , no additional issues raised
- Move to WGLC?