Status and going forward with draft-ietf-v6ops-v6onbydefault-03 draft-ietf-v6ops-onlinkassumption-02

Pekka Savola

Background

- The documents had IESG review in May 2004
  - The biggest issue (by Wasserman and Narten) was that it described work-in-progress solutions
  - Either:
    - The proposed solutions needed to be removed, or
    - We should wait for the affected WGs to fix the problems and add normative references
  - We started working on getting the WGs fix the problems
    - Later on, the authors resubmitted the documents, removing the fixes

Status of the Issues

- TCP soft-errors
  - Has been actively debated in TCPM wg for almost a year
    - ▷ Finally, soon may be adopted for Informational, with caveats
    - ▷ "This is incompliant with RFC1122, but here is the spec and here are the tradeoffs"
- SCTP and DCCP soft-errors
  - Has been reported to the people a year or so ago
    - ▷ No progress yet..
- On-link assumption
  - Waiting for draft-ietf-ipv6-rfc2461bis (past WGLC)
- Default Address selection - unreachable destinations
  - No work done; needed due to onlink removal and soft errors?
- Application robustness
  - Application transition document done
  - A new [sctp_]connectx() generalization API in progress
    - ▷ But slow.. shim6 may also have interests in this space?

Going Forward

- **What is the best approach here?**
  - Just document the problems and be done (at this WG)
    - ▷ [IMHO] not good, because the problems likely won't actually get fixed..
    - ▷ Is the community usefully served by just documenting the problems in an RFC?
  - Wait for the fixes to appear, and publish then
    - ▷ Could take a while.. (energy, time)

- **What is the role of draft-ietf-v6ops-v6onbydefault ?**
  - A more or less a "standing" document describing all the issues?
    - ▷ Until it's made to sit down..
  - Should we try to separate the issues in different I-Ds?
  - Should we do major updates based on v6 Fix findings?
    - ▷ Suggestion: move some text from v6fix to here