

# **Considerations of Using Unique Local Addresses**

(draft-ietf-v6ops-ula-usage-considerations-02)

***Bing Liu, Sheng Jiang***  
*IETF 99@Prague, July 2017*

# Reminder

- *draft-ietf-v6ops-ula-usage-recommendations-00*  
adopted in May 2013
- *draft-ietf-v6ops-ula-usage-considerations-00*  
reshaped in Feb 2016
- Before ietf98, WG chair asked peoples' opinion on:
  - 1) continue to work on the draft with an eye toward publication in 2017
  - 2) or allow the draft to expire
- And the conclusion was:
  - Continue as an Informational document  
(milestone: Nov 2017)
  - Attempt to find some set of considerations upon which the WG can agree

# Summarized comments around ietf98

- Comments from ***Victor Kuarsingh***
  - Suggested to condense the document to concentrate on the three deployment models:
    - 1) Isolated networks (potential valid ULA-only use case)
    - 2) Multi-addressed (ULA+GUA, potential valid)
    - 3) Internet connected (ULA+NPTv6, harmful choice)
- Comments from ***Tim Chow***
  - Condense the document to find the minimum set of messages to include in the document to achieve that consensus to publish

# Summarized comments around ietf98

- Comments from **Joel Jaeggli**
  - “the presence of npt6 or indeed any form of ula-only deployment, save perhaps for ephemeral private networks is a bright line not to be crossed”
- Comments from **Lorenzo Colitti**
  - “not willing to see this document published without strong language recommending against ULA+NPTv6”
- Comments from **Brian Carpenter**
  - “ULAs just work in simple scenarios, but running with multiple prefixes should be standard practice for IPv6 so we need to tie down the loose ends”
  - “ULAs are basically harmless domestic animals. (ULA+) NPTv6 is a Frankenstein monster, of course” 😊

# Content of the 02 version

<u>1.</u>	Introduction . . . . .	<u>2</u>
<u>2.</u>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>3.</u>	General Considerations For Using ULAs . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>3.1.</u>	Do Not Treat ULA Equal to <a href="#">RFC1918</a> . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>3.2.</u>	Using ULAs in a Limited Scope . . . . .	<u>4</u>
<u>4.</u>	Analysis and Operational Considerations for Scenarios Using ULAs . . . . .	<u>4</u>
<u>4.1.</u>	ULA-only in Isolated Networks . . . . .	<u>4</u>
<u>4.2.</u>	ULA+PA in Connected Networks . . . . .	<u>5</u>
<u>4.3.</u>	ULA-Only in Connected Networks . . . . .	<u>7</u>
<u>4.4.</u>	Some Specific Use Cases . . . . .	<u>8</u>
<u>4.4.1.</u>	Special Routing . . . . .	<u>8</u>
<u>4.4.2.</u>	Used as Identifier . . . . .	<u>8</u>
<u>4.5.</u>	IPv4 Co-existence Considerations . . . . .	<u>9</u>
<u>5.</u>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<u>9</u>

Largely condensed the content

# On “ULA-Only in Connected Networks” (*Section 4.3*)

- “This document does not consider ULA+NPTv6/Proxy as a good choice for normal cases. Rather, this document considers ULA+PA (Provider Aggregated) as a better approach to connect to the global network when ULAs are expected to be retained.”

# Next Step

- Request more reviews
  - Thanks *Brian Carpenter* for the throughout review
- Move forward to WGLC
  - Make a 03 version based on potential future comments
  - Request WGLC

# Comments?

## Thank you!

*IETF99@Prague*