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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?