

---

## **AD feedback on rfc2462bis <draft-ietf-ipv6-rfc2462bis-06.txt>**

JINMEI, Tatuya

Toshiba Corporation / The KAME Project  
jinmei@{isl.rdc.toshiba.co.jp, kame.net}

---

### **Document status**

- WGLC was completed (July 2004)
- A new version (06) was out (August 2004)
  - addressing misc. comments after LC
  - submitted to the IESG (Sept. 2004)
- AD review was finished (October 2004)
  - two major issues
    - M/O flags
    - "stateful" vs DHCPv6
  - discussed on the wg list
  - seems to get consensus
    - => will confirm that in this session

## The M/O flag behavior (1/2)

---

- In rfc2462bis-06
  - M/O flags show availability of DHCPv6, not a mandatory trigger to invoke it
  - "details will be described in a separate doc"
- AD comment on this
  - this can be a stale reference in rfc2462bis
- Proposed resolution
  - make the separation rather clearer:
    - not mention the M/O flags in rfc2462bis at all
  - describe the details on the flags in a PS doc
    - draft-daniel-ipv6-ra-mo-flags-01.txt (just adopted as a wg doc)

## The M/O flag behavior (2/2)

---

- The rationale
  - the overall direction was based on wg consensus
  - now we have a wg-doc-to-be on the M/O flag usage
  - most part of rfc2462bis is independent of M/O
    - LL conf, global address conf, DAD, address lifetimes
    - DHCPv6 can run concurrently on stateless autoconf

## **Stateful configuration vs DHCPv6 (1/2)**

---

- In rfc2462bis-06
  - keep the wording "stateful"
    - it's used as a part of the "O" flag...
  - and clarify why we use "stateful" while RFC3736 calls it "stateless"
  - ugly, but we did not want to introduce a radical change...
- AD comment on this
  - it's just confusing

## **Stateful configuration vs DHCPv6 (2/2)**

---

- Proposed resolution
  - remove "stateful", and just use DHCPv6 instead
  - should be OK if we agree with the previous change
    - rfc2462bis won't use the phrase of "other stateful configuration" for the O flag
- Additional effects
  - rfc2461bis and the M/O doc will need to be modified

## Change on the "A" flag

---

- AD comment
  - What happens if the value of the "autonomous address-configuration flag" changes over time?
- Answer: nothing.
  - ON to OFF => just ignore the flag
  - OFF to ON => same as just "ON"
    - (regardless of the previous value)
  - should be pretty clear in Section 5.5.3

## Other issues

---

- Terminology ordering
  - alphabetical or "as is"?
  - => there seems to be dependency, so "as is" is probably better
- Need a reference to addr-arch in LL conf
  - => will do
- Not-so-consistent wording
  - "all addresses **must** be tested (DAD)...DAD **can be disabled** through the admin setting"
  - just a wording issue (not an RFC2119 keyword)
  - => s/must/should (basically)/

## Next Steps

---

- Make sure that the resolutions are okay
  - several positive responses and no negative one on the list
- Revise the draft
  - including the proposed change
  - A snapshot is available at
  - [www.jinmei.org/draft-ietf-ipv6-rfc2462bis-07beta1.txt](http://www.jinmei.org/draft-ietf-ipv6-rfc2462bis-07beta1.txt)
- Then...
  - hold it waiting for rfc2461bis? (another AD comment)
  - proceed to IETF LC anyway?