

PCP DS-Lite Draft

IETF 87, Berlin

Margaret Wasserman

mrw@painless-security.com

Draft Status

- Working Group draft -00 published in June
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-pcp-dslite/>
- Very short document on how to use PCP with DS-Lite
- Only contains what was originally called “Plain Mode”

Issue 1: “Plain Mode” References

- The document makes references to “plain mode”, but it is unexplained and no other mode exists.
- **Resolution: Clean up the wording.**

(Margaret Wasserman)

Issue 2: Node Behind B4?

- Document currently says that the V6 (tunnel outer address) should be preferred.
- Should the document also say whether the PCP server should (may, must not) accept requests originating from hosts behind the B4?
 - i.e. Should the server listen on 192.0.0.1 (tunnel inner address)
- **Proposed Resolution: The WG chose to publish only “plain mode”, which does not include traffic from behind the B4.**

(Paul Selkirk)

Issue 3: Epoch Clarification

- RFC 6887 section 8.5 says: “A PCP server MAY maintain one Epoch Time value for all PCP clients or MAY maintain distinct Epoch Time values (per PCP client, per interface, or based on other criteria); this choice is implementation-dependent.”
- The draft should say that, for purposes of interpreting the preceding sentence, a B4 address is a single client, whether requests are tunneled or encapsulated. In other words, use the same epoch for all requests from the same subscriber.
- Resolution depends on previous Issue #2

(Paul Selkirk)

Issue 4: Address Change for CPE

- In IPv6, CPE is assigned a prefix and may use any address in prefix.
- If CPE reboots and uses new address, mappings may exist for old address.
- **Resolution Choices:**
 - Per-prefix mapping?
 - Require CPE to use consistent address?
 - Other?

(Suresh Kumar Vinapamula Venkata)

Discussion and Next Steps

- Are there any open issues that aren't listed here?
- Resolve issues and update document