

IPv6 Addressing Architecture Update

IETF 62

8 March 2005

Bob Hinden

STATUS

- Goal to move to Draft Standard
- New Draft
 - <draft-ietf-ipv6-addr-arch-v4-01.txt>
- Diff from previous draft at:
<http://people.nokia.net/~hinden/draft-ietf-ipv6-addr-arch-v4-01.html>
- Diff from RFC at:
<http://people.nokia.net/~hinden/diff-rfc-draft.html>

CHANGES FROM RFC3513 (1)

- Deprecated the Site-Local prefix. Changes included
 - Removed Site-Local from special list of prefixes in Section 2.4.
 - Split section titled "Local-use IPv6 Unicast Addresses" into two sections, "Link-Local IPv6 Unicast Addresses" and "Site-Local IPv6 Unicast Addresses".
 - Added text to new section describing Site-Local deprecation.
- Changes to resolve issues raised in IAB response to Robert Elz appeal. Changes include:
 - Added clarification to Section 2.5 that nodes should make no assumptions about the structure of an IPv6 address.
 - Changed the text in Section 2.5.1 and Appendix A to refer to the modified EUI-64 format interface identifiers with the "u" bit set to one (1) as universal.
 - Added clarification to Section 2.5.1 that IPv6 nodes are not required to validate that interface identifiers created in modified EUI-64 format with the "u" bit set to one are unique.

CHANGES FROM RFC3513 (2)

- Changed the reference indicated in Section 2.5.4 "Global Unicast Addresses" to RFC3587.
- Removed mention of NSAP addresses in examples.
- Clarified that the "x" in the textual representation can only be one to four digits in length
- Editorial changes.

LAST CALL ISSUES (1)

- Mohsen Souissi, 8 Mar 2005
 - In section 2.7 ("Multicast Addresses"): "link-local and site-local multicast scopes span the same topological regions as the corresponding unicast scopes."
- This is confusing since we deprecated Site-Local
- Proposed resolution
 - Remove sentence. Not needed and multicast scoping is described in detail in Scoped Addressing Architecture

LAST CALL ISSUES (2)

- Pekka Savola, 22 Feb 2005
 - The use of compatible addresses does not belong to the revised addr arch specification, especially if we want to move it to Draft Standard. I suggest removing it right now to avoid fuss in the future.
- Discussed on mailing list under thread “IPv6 Address Architecture update question”
 - My read of the discussion was to not remove them
- Proposed resolution:
 - Keep as is

LAST CALL ISSUES (3)

- Pekka Savola, 22 Feb 2005
 - Site local deprecation document is Proposed Standard (it should have been published as BCP, sigh..), so it cannot be a normative reference if we want to move this to Draft Standard (unless SLDEP is also moved to DS). Luckily enough, I think this only provides additional information, so it should be OK to move it over to Informative references.
- Agree that we should resolve
- Proposed resolution:
 - Change to Informational reference

NEXT STEPS

- Ready to advance to IESG?
 - With agreed changes