

IPv6 Site-Local Moderate Usage

Bob Hinden / Nokia

MY MODERATE PROPOSAL

- Not an official chair position
- Goal is to present a framework for what I think makes sense given the discussion
- Pragmatically I think that people will create and use limited scope addresses even if we say “no”.
 - Firewalls create limited scope addresses from global
 - Better to have a defined structure and guidance

SIMPLE SITE-BORDER ROUTER

- Router with “no-site” interface
 - Hard Site-Local filters built in for interfaces in “no-site” site
 - Black hole route for FEC0::/10
- Firewall at Site Border that enforces Site boundary
- Little or No impact on routing protocols, etc.

NODES

- No requirement for multi-site nodes
 - Hosts and Routers
- All routers include Black hole route for FEC0::/10
- Vendors may build multi-site nodes
 - But, no IETF requirement to do so
- Useful to document pitfalls of doing multi-site nodes

DNS

- Keep Site-Local out of Global DNS
 - Need equivalent of Site Border router for DNS
- Range of Solutions Possible
 - Enterprise and Home sites may need different solutions
- Two-Face / Split DNS
 - Very common for IPv4 Enterprises today
- Mark Andrews proposal

- Ask DNS-EXT w.g. to take on this work (?)

APPLICATIONS

- Issues with Applications are real
- However, site-local usage isn't worse than
 - Firewalls creating limited scope addresses and/or
 - People creating their own limited scope addresses
- Important that API's allow application to override Address Selection defaults

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.