



# ***Comments in the wg last call for IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture***

Steve Deering, Brian Haberman, Tatuya Jinmei,  
Erik Nordmark, Atsushi Onoe, Brian Zill

## ***Summary on this last call***

---

- Chairs issued a last call on Oct. 22
- Several people have made comments
  - discussed on the ML
  - seems to reach a consensus on most of them

- By Juergen Schoenwaelder
- In the current draft
  - "It is convenient to reserve the index value ZERO...to mean 'use the default zone'"
  - "An implementation may additionally define a separate default zone for each scope type"
- Issue:
  - MIB doc uses ZERO as default in several places.
- Suggestion:
  - "SHOULD" use zero as the default zone ID

## ***Site-local deprecation***

---

- By Juergen Schoenwaelder
- Add a reference to deprecate-site-local-xx
  - as an informative one

- From draft-main-ipaddr-text-rep
- In the current draft
  - Simply says in the form of  
`<address>%<zone_id>`
  - `<address>` is a literal IPv6 address
- Resolution:
  - Add a reference to the text-rep draft
  - The `<address>` part follows the suggested ABNF
  - Normative or informative?

## *Comments from Pekka Savola (1/4)*

---

- Number of Authors
  - basically no more than 5 are allowed (currently 6)
    - to be compliant to ID-nits/rfc-editor policy
  - => discuss this within the authors
- Default zone IDs for "subnet-local" multicast scope
  - => simply remove "subnet-local"
  - already removed from addr-arch spec
    - RFC3513/addr-arch-v4

## *Comments from Pekka Savola: (2/4)*

---

- Textual representation
  - Remove the example of BGP peering
  - => accepted
    - usage is controversial
    - RIR's introduced IX-based global prefixes
    - it's just an example, after all
  - Interaction with URIs
    - Could be read to impose requirements to applications
    - => Not the intention, revise the wording.
  - Clarify why the zone ID part contains "scope type"
    - may need a background story(?)

## ***Comments from Pekka Savola: (3/4)***

---

- ICMPv6 update
  - a normative reference, but still work in progress
  - => we can proceed concurrently
- Use a proper term for "IPv4 auto-configuration addresses"
- Unclear wording in Section 5
  - Each interface belongs to exactly one zone of each possible scope.



## ***Comments from Pekka Savola (4/4)***

---

- Section 7: sending packets
  - clarify how to choose the outgoing interface
- Section 9: Forwarding
  - clarify text
- Section 9: ICMPv6 error message
  - do not send an error for multicasted packets
- Section 10: (multicast) routing
  - use "group(s)" instead of "prefix(es)"
- Many editorial nits

- Basically there seems to be a consensus on how to fix the issues.
- Revise the draft, then to advance(?)