Host Address Availability Recommendations

draft-ietf-v6ops-host-addr-availability-02

Vint Cerf, Stuart Cheshire, Lorenzo Colitti, David Schinazi

IETF 94, Yokohama, November 2015

Current state of the draft

- WGLC expired September 28
- Still appears to be broad support
- Made minor changes and uploaded -02

Feedback from WGLC

- Lots of support and suggestions for clarifying the text - thanks!
- Individual WG member concerns:
  - /64 per host excessive?
    - Addressed by noting that /64 cannot be further subdivided [RFC7421]. Also, draft only recommends /64 for general purpose hosts when SLAAC is not in use
  - Use cases for multiple addresses are weak and recommendation is one-size fits all
    - Authors feel that the draft provides sufficient motivation, and recommendation is appropriate because scoped to general-purpose hosts
  - Should provide more clarification that per-IP-address charging model is bad
    - Draft already addresses this; not much we can do beyond saying it's ineffective. Also, per-device charging is not the only issue
  - Should make a stronger case why on-demand address allocation is undesirable
    - Draft already addresses this in some detail

(Minor) Changes since -01

- Added text to further justify recommendation for /64 per host
  - “If the prefix is a /64, it can be extended via L2 bridging, ND proxying or /64 sharing, but it cannot be further subdivided, as a prefix longer than /64 is outside the current IPv6 specifications.”
- “Smaller prefix” -> “longer prefix”
- Documented assertions on university networks using tracking with SLAAC
- Minor clarifications, reworded some of the text, fixed spelling errors

Next steps

- IETF last call?