Basic Transition Mechanisms

Basic Transition Mechanisms update

draft-ietf-v6ops-mech-v2-02.txt
draft-savola-v6ops-mechv2-interop-impl-template-00.txt

Pekka Savola, CSC/FUNET

Transmech status

Transmech status and steps forward

- ☐ Until now
  - ○ Updated -01 to -02
  - ○ No issues raised at the second WG LC
  - ○ Sent to the IESG, for Proposed Standard

- ☐ Next steps
  - ○ Wait for IETF Last Call comments (if any)
  - ○ Wait for IESG feedback and resolve
  - ○ Get consensus on implementation and interoperability reports
    - ▷ Draft out, but no comments yet

- ☐ Next 6 months
  - ○ Wait for the implementations to be revised?
  - ○ Get the implementation & interop reports
  - ○ Revise the specification if needed
  - ○ Submit as Draft Standard

Transmech changes

Transmech changes between 01 and 02

- ☐ Functional changes (at least)
  - ○ Unidirectional tunnels removed
  - ○ Remove DNS operational guidance, refer to another document
  - ○ Remove SHOULD req on link-locals being based on IPv4
  - ○ Add SHOULD requirement for setting source address of tunnel
  - ○ Add MUST checks for source addresses
  - ○ Should be possible to choose either static/dynamic MTU on per-tunnel basis if both implemented
  - ○ Static MTU can now default to anything between 1280 and 1480 bytes
    - ▷ But if not 1280, knobs to set it MUST be in place
  - ○ Add minimal MUST rules for IPv4 reassembly and IPv6 MRU
  - ○ Summary
    - ▷ Previous implementations should interoperate, but are non-compliant

- ☐ Editorial changes
  - ○ A lot..

Implementation & Interoperability

Implementation & Interoperability

☐ Implementation status must be verified before DS

- ○ Each feature
- ○ In the draft, done in excruciating detail

☐ Interoperability of specific features must be tested

- ○ Each feature must interoperate
- ○ Also done in detail
- ○ Organizing the actual testing it out of scope
  - ▷ Does anyone want to volunteer to do something?

☐ Questions to ask

- ○ Is using a detailed template a good idea?
- ○ Should the template be returned separately for implementation and interoperability?
  - ▷ The former is easier to fill, so we might get feedback faster..
- ○ Other issues? Thoughts?