

ARP/ND Optimization



LI YIZHOU LIYIZHOU@HUAWEI.COM

LINDA DUNBAR

RADIA PERLMAN

DONALD EASTLAKE

MOHAMMED UMARI

Outstanding Comments

2

- GENART review
 - <https://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/trill/current/msg07842.html>
- OPS DIR review
 - <https://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/trill/current/msg07866.html>
- Security AD comments
 - <https://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/trill/current/msg07859.html>

GENART Review

3

- A fairly lengthy review but almost entirely editorial and clarification.
- The only real disagreement with the reviewer is that they think that saying “X is out of scope” (and saying nothing else about X) implies that some mechanism to do X exists. The authors think saying that something is out of scope for a document does not imply anything about whether X exists or does not exist.

OPS DIR Review

4

- **Operational Considerations**
 - Network impact of failure to optimize should be no worse than the existing case without optimization.
 - Addition of statistical counters and verification mechanisms should be considered.
- **Management Considerations**
 - How to configure between different policies should be covered, ideally as a YANG Model.
 - Needs statistical counters.

Security AD Comments

5

- Need a clearer comparison of the security of using or not using the optimizations in the draft.
 - Generally security about the same unless you are using a complete reliable directory, in which case it is more secure.
- Question about handling duplicate IP addresses.
 - Answer is that it is basically local policy unless you are using a complete reliable directory which you should trust the directory more than ARP/ND messages.
- How does logging solve duplicate addresses?
 - It doesn't but is still recommended.

Security AD Comments

6

- What if an attacker sets up a fake DHCP server... You need to do a detailed threat analysis.
 - Generally, a fake DHCP server screws things up. It is not a reasonable goal of this draft to do a detailed threat analysis of all the ways that all of the Layer 2 related IETF standards are inherently insecure.
- Also some editorial and clarity comments, some of which duplicate items in the GENART Review.

Path Forward

7

- Current state is Publication Requested
 1. Resolve comments
 2. When comments are resolved and ADs have signed off, the document would be released from the IESG to the RFC Editor.

END



LI YIZHOU LIYIZHOU@HUAWEI.COM

LINDA DUNBAR

RADIA PERLMAN

DONALD EASTLAKE

MOHAMMED UMARI