

6man Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: April 23, 2026

W. Cheng  
L. Gong  
China Mobile  
C. Lin  
H. Li  
New H3C Technologies  
October 20, 2025

Source IPv6 Address Programmability  
draft-cheng-6man-source-address-programmability-05

Abstract

IPv6-based tunneling technologies, such as SRv6, have been deployed by provider on transport networks to provide users with services such as VPN and SD-WAN.

After the service traffic enters the provider's transport network, it will be encapsulated by tunnel (SRv6 encapsulation). In order to better meet the SLA requirements of users, some technologies need to carry relevant information along with the flow to guide the processing of packets during forwarding.

This document discusses the programmability of IPv6 source addresses to carry the necessary flow information

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on March 3, 2025.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2023 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

#### Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
1.1. Requirements Language .....	3
2. Restrictions for IPv6 Source address programmability .....	3
3. Requirement for IPv6 source address programmability.....	4
4. Scenarios of IPv6 source address programmability .....	5
5. IANA Considerations .....	7
6. Security Considerations .....	7
7. References .....	7
7.1. Normative References .....	7
Contributors .....	9
Authors' Addresses .....	10

#### 1. Introduction

IPv6-based tunneling technologies, such as SRv6, have been deployed by provider on transport networks to provide users with services such as VPN and SD-WAN.

When the ingress node (PE) of the transport network receives user traffic, it can add IPv6 (SRv6) encapsulation to the user traffic according to VPN routes and policies, and the encapsulated service traffic is forwarded to the egress device of the transport network.

SRv6 [RFC8754] is a source routing technology. The ingress node of the transport network encapsulates the forwarding path (segment list) of user traffic in SRH. The encapsulated user traffic will be forwarded to the egress node according to the path specified by the SRH.

Meanwhile, in order to better meet user SLA requirements and provide differentiated services, it is necessary to be able to carry flow-related information with the traffic.

Although IPv6 itself provides a variety of extension headers, which can carry various flow information through extension headers, due to various considerations such as bandwidth utilization and device implementation difficulty, carrying flow information through source addresses is becoming a possible choice

This document mainly discusses the requirements for source IPv6 address programmability to support subsequent related specifications or protocol extensions.

### 1.1. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## 2. Restrictions for IPv6 Source address programmability

The IPv6 source address programmability described in this document is limited to a limited or trusted domain, such as the SRv6 domain of a provider's transport network.

In a limited domain or trusted domain, the programmable capability of the IPv6 source address is allowed to carry flow information. That is, when the business flow enters the trust domain, it is encapsulated, and the flow information is encoded in the source address at the same time. Encapsulation is removed when business traffic leaves the trust domain. This leakage of source addresses outside the trusted domain needs to be avoided.

End-to-end IPv6 source address programmability is not recommended.




Figure 1: example topology

### 3. Requirement for IPv6 source address programmability

In some scenarios, flow information needs to be carried with the packet to help routers to perform special processing on the packet when forwarding. The flow information may be associated with the local resources of the router, and are used to guarantee the bandwidth of a specific flow; or identify a certain attribute of the service flow, through which the forwarding policy can be applied, and so on.

Although various extension headers have been defined in [RFC8200], information can be carried through these different types of extension headers. However, based on the current actual situation, there are some defects in carrying information through the extension header, such as

#### o Low bandwidth utilization

Taking SRv6 TE as an example, user traffic is encapsulated with SRH and IPv6 headers on the headend node, and the newly added encapsulation itself occupies part of the bandwidth. If flow information is carried through other extension headers such as DOH or HBH, the bandwidth utilization rate will further decrease, especially for small packets.

#### o Highly difficult to implement

According to the definition of [RFC8200], the DOH and HBH option extension headers are suitable for carrying information. If the DOH

is placed before the SRH, each endpoint node can read the content of the DOH; if it is placed after the SRH, only the destination node can read the content of the DOH.

If it is required that the forwarding nodes along the way can read the flow information, the information can only be carried through HBH. However, due to historical reasons, current mainstream network devices generally support HBH only limitedly. Although currently IETF has some discussions and related documents on HBH, such as [I-D.ietf-6man-hbh-processing], it is still difficult for routers to support HBH

In this realistic situation, it is hoped that the information along with the flow can be carried without increasing the length of the packet, and the intermediate router can realize the function relatively easily. IPv6 source address has become an unavoidable choice.

IPv6 addresses have a relatively large 128-bit space. SRv6 uses this feature to define segments with various behaviors, most of which can be used as IPv6 destination addresses. When the IPv6 destination address of a packet is a segment instantiated locally, the Endpoint processes the packet according to the definition of the segment. The transit node only uses the destination address for basic IPv6 forwarding. [I-D.ietf-6man-sids] also explains this situation.

This document discusses the need for IPv6 source address programmability. It is hoped that as the source address of the IPv6 header, it can be used to identify the source node of the tunnel encapsulation, and at the same time, it can also carry related information of the flow.

The intermediate nodes of the forwarding path, not limited to the endpoint, can obtain the necessary information from the source address, and guide the forwarding and processing of the flow together with the destination address

Address structures for programmable source addresses are outside the scope of this document

#### 4. Scenarios of IPv6 source address programmability

This section lists some scenarios where flow information needs to be carried with the packet.

- o Scenario of network slicing

Network slicing provides the ability to partition a physical network into multiple isolated logical networks of varying sizes, structures, and functions so that each slice can be dedicated to specific services or customers. [I-D.ietf-teas-ietf-network-slices] defines the term "IETF Network Slice" and establishes the general principles of network slicing in the IETF context.

Packets belong to a network slice need to be forwarded using the specific network resources. [I-D.ietf-teas-ietf-network-slices] defines the network resource mapped to the network slice as NRP, that is, the Network Resource Partition, and defines the `nrp-id` to identify the NRP used in the forwarding process.

In a network that provides slicing services, the NRP-ID can be carried in the packet. In the process of packet forwarding, the routers on the forwarding path can extract NRP-ID from the packet, determine the NRP to which the packet belongs, and then forward the packet using the resources associated with the NRP.

There are still various discussions on how to carry NRP-ID. For example, [I-D.ietf-6man-enhanced-vpn-vtn-id] defines options for carrying NRP-ID through IPv6 extension headers. [I-D.liu-spring-nrp-id-in-srv6-segment] proposes to carry the NRP-ID through the `arg` field of the segment. [I-D.cheng-spring-srv6-encoding-network-sliceid] proposed to carry NRP-ID through source address.

Therefore, for network slicing, carrying the NRP-ID through the source address is a direction that can be considered.

#### o Scenario of APN

[I-D.li-apn-problem-statement-usecases] analyzes the existing problems caused by lack of application awareness, and outlines various use cases that could benefit from Application-aware Networking (APN) architecture.

[I-D.li-apn-ipv6-encap] defines the option to carry the APN attribute in the IPv6 data plane, which can be applied to DOH, HBH option extension header, and TLV of SRH.

Of course, APN attributes can be very rich, but if the APN attribute can be abstracted into a digital APN ID, which can represent the application to which a flow belongs, the intermediate node of the forwarding path can apply related policies based on this APN ID. Then this APN-ID can also be carried by the source IPv6 address.

#### o Scenario of MVPN

The provider offer VPN service, and after the user traffic reaches the egress router, it needs to know which VPN the user traffic belongs to. How to identify which VPN the user traffic belongs to, unicast and multicast behave differently.

Still taking the IPv6 data plane as an example, SRv6 is used to provide unicast L3VPN services. When the user traffic reaches the egress router, its destination address is usually the segment of the End.DT4/End.DT6/End.DT46[RFC8986] type of the egress router. These segments are created on the egress router and associated with the local VPN. The egress router continues to forward the decapsulated user traffic within the VPN associated with the segment.

For multicast VPN, encapsulated user traffic is sent to multiple egress routers at the same time through multicast forwarding, so the segment of the egress router cannot be used like unicast VPN service.

Therefore, multicast VPN is also a potential scenario where IPv6 source addresses can be programmed.

## 5. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

## 6. Security Considerations

TBD

## 7. References

### 7.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-6man-hbh-processing] Hinden, R. M. and G. Fairhurst, "IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options Processing Procedures", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-6man-hbh-processing-05, 23 February 2023.

[I-D.ietf-6man-sids] Krishnan. S, "Segment Identifiers in SRv6", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-6man-sids-02, 11 October 2022.

- [I-D.ietf-teas-ietf-network-slices] Farrel, A., Gray, E., Drake, J., Rokui, R., Homma, S., Makhijani, K., Contreras, L., and J. Tantsura, "Framework for IETF Network Slices", draft-ietf-teas-ietf-network-slices-19 (work in progress), January 2023.
- [I-D.li-apn-problem-statement-usecases] Li, Z., Peng, S., Voyer, D., Xie, C., Liu, P., Qin, Z., and Mishra, G., " Problem Statement and Use Cases of Application-aware Networking (APN) ", draft-li-apn-problem-statement-usecases-07 (work in progress), April 2023.
- [I-D.li-apn-ipv6-encap] Li, Z., Peng, S., and Xie, C., " Application-aware IPv6 Networking (APN6) Encapsulation ", draft-li-apn-ipv6-encap-06 (work in progress), December 2022.
- [I-D.ietf-6man-enhanced-vpn-vtn-id] Dong, J., Li, Z., Xie, C., Ma, C., and G. Mishra, "Carrying Virtual Transport Network (VTN) Identifier in IPv6 Extension Header", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-6man-enhanced-vpn-vtn-id-02, April 2023.
- [I-D.liu-spring-nrp-id-in-srv6-segment] Liu, Y., Lin, C., Li, H., and Gong, L., "NRP ID in SRv6 segment", draft-liu-spring-nrp-id-in-srv6-segment-01 (Work in Progress), April 2023.
- [I-D.cheng-spring-srv6-encoding-network-sliceid] Cheng, W., Lin, C., Gong, L., Zadok, S., and X. Wang, "Encoding Network SliceIdentification for SRv6", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-cheng-spring-srv6-encoding-network-sliceid-05, April 2023.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.



- [RFC8200] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 86, RFC 8200, DOI 10.17487/RFC8200, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8200>>.
- [RFC8754] Filsfils, C., Ed., Dukes, D., Ed., Previdi, S., Leddy, J., Matsushima, S., and D. Voyer, "IPv6 Segment Routing Header (SRH)", RFC 8754, DOI 10.17487/RFC8754, March 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8754>>.
- [RFC8986] Filsfils, C., Ed., Camarillo, P., Ed., Leddy, J., Voyer, D., Matsushima, S., and Z. Li, "Segment Routing over IPv6 (SRv6) Network Programming", RFC 8986, DOI 10.17487/RFC8986, February 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8986>>.

## Contributors

Authors' Addresses

Weiqiang Cheng  
China Mobile  
Beijing  
China

Email: [chengweiqiang@chinamobile.com](mailto:chengweiqiang@chinamobile.com)

Liyan Gong  
China Mobile  
Beijing  
China

Email: [gongliyan@chinamobile.com](mailto:gongliyan@chinamobile.com)

Changwang Lin  
New H3C Technologies  
Beijing  
China

Email: [linchangwang.04414@h3c.com](mailto:linchangwang.04414@h3c.com)

Hao Li  
New H3C Technologies  
Beijing  
China

Email: [lihao@h3c.com](mailto:lihao@h3c.com)

