

6man  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [2460](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Best Current Practice  
Expires: February 22, 2016

F. Gont  
UTN-FRH / SI6 Networks  
W. Liu  
Huawei Technologies  
R. Bonica  
Juniper Networks  
August 21, 2015

**Transmission and Processing of IPv6 Options**  
**draft-gont-6man-ipv6-opt-transmit-02.txt**

Abstract

Various IPv6 options have been standardized since the core IPv6 standard was first published. This document updates [RFC 2460](#) to clarify how nodes should deal with such IPv6 options and with any options that are defined in the future. It complements [[RFC7045](#)], which offers a similar clarification regarding IPv6 Extension Headers.

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). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on February 22, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction and Problem Statement . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology and Conventions Used in This Document . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Conventions . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Considerations for All IPv6 Options . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Processing of currently-defined IPv6 Options . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Hop-by-Hop Options Header . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Destination Options Header . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction and Problem Statement

Various IPv6 options have been standardized since the core IPv6 standard [[RFC2460](#)] was first published. Except for the padding options (Pad1 and PadN), all the options that have so far been specified are meant to be employed with specific IPv6 Extension Header (EH) types. Additionally, some options have specific requirements such as, for example, only allowing a single instance of the option in the corresponding IPv6 extension header. This establishes some criteria for validating packets that employ IPv6 options.

[[RFC2460](#)] specifies that IPv6 extension headers (with the exception of the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header) are not examined or processed by any node along a packet's delivery path, until the packet reaches the node (or each of the set of nodes, in the case of multicast) identified in the Destination Address field of the IPv6 header. However, in practice this is not really the case: some routers, and a variety of middleboxes such as firewalls, load balancers, or packet classifiers, might inspect other parts of each packet [[RFC7045](#)]. Hence both end-nodes and intermediate nodes may end up inspecting the contents of extension headers and discard packets based on the presence of specific IPv6 options.



This document clarifies the default processing of IPv6 options. In those cases in which the specifications add additional constraints/requirements regarding IPv6 options, such additional constraints/requirements are also taken into account.

## **2. Terminology and Conventions Used in This Document**

### **2.1. Terminology**

In the remainder of this document, the term "forwarding node" refers to any router, firewall, load balancer, prefix translator, or any other device or middlebox that forwards IPv6 packets with or without examining the packet in any way.

In this document, "standard" IPv6 options are those specified in detail by IETF Standards Actions [[RFC5226](#)]. "Experimental" options include those defined by any Experimental RFC and the option types 0x1E, 0x3E, 0x5E, 0x7E, 0x9E, 0xBE, 0xDE, and 0xFE, defined by [[RFC3692](#)] and [[RFC4727](#)] when used as experimental options. "Defined" options are the "standard" options plus the "experimental" ones.

The terms "permit" (allow the traffic), "drop" (drop with no notification to sender), and "reject" (drop with appropriate notification to sender) are employed as defined in [[RFC3871](#)]. Throughout this document we also employ the term "discard" as a generic term to indicate the act of discarding a packet, irrespective of whether the sender is notified of such packet drops.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

### **2.2. Conventions**

This document clarifies some basic validation of IPv6 options, and specifies the default processing of them. We recommend that a configuration option is made available to govern the processing of each IPv6 option type, on a per-EH-type granularity. Such configuration options may include the following possible settings:

- o Permit this IPv6 Option type
- o Drop (and log) packets containing this IPv6 option type
- o Reject (and log) packets containing this IPv6 option type (where the packet drop is signaled with an ICMPv6 error message)



- o Rate-limit the processing of packets containing this IPv6 option type
- o Ignore this IPv6 option type (forwarding packets that contain them)

We note that special care needs to be taken when devices log packet drops/rejects. Devices should count the number of packets dropped/rejected, but the logging of drop/reject events should be limited so as to not overburden device resources.

Finally, we note that when discarding packets, it is generally desirable that the sender be signaled of the packet drop, since this is of use for trouble-shooting purposes. However, throughout this document (when recommending that packets be discarded) we generically refer to the action as "discard" without specifying whether the sender is signaled of the packet drop.

### **3. Considerations for All IPv6 Options**

Forwarding nodes that discard packets (by default) based on the presence of IPv6 options are known to cause connectivity failures and deployment problems. Any forwarding node along an IPv6 packet's path, which forwards the packet for any reason, SHOULD do so regardless of any IPv6 Destination Options that are present, as required by [[RFC2460](#)]. Exceptionally, if a forwarding node is designed to examine IPv6 Destination Options for any reason, such as firewalling, it MUST recognise and deal appropriately with all standard IPv6 options types and SHOULD recognise and deal appropriately with all experimental IPv6 options. The list of standard and experimental option types is maintained by IANA (see [[IANA-IPv6-PARAM](#)]), and implementors are advised to check this list regularly for updates.

In the case of some options meant to be included in IPv6 extension headers other than Hop-by-Hop Options, [[RFC2460](#)] requires destination hosts to discard the corresponding packet if the option is unrecognised. However, intermediate forwarding nodes SHOULD NOT do this, since doing so might cause them to inadvertently discard traffic using a recently standardised IPv6 option not yet recognised by the intermediate node. The exceptions to this rule are discussed next.

If a forwarding node discards a packet containing a standard IPv6 option, it MUST be the result of a configurable policy and not just the result of a failure to recognise such an option. This means that the discard policy for each standard type of IPv6 option MUST be



individually configurable. The default configuration SHOULD allow all standard IPv6 options.

Experimental IPv6 options SHOULD be treated in the same way as standard IPv6 options, including an individually configurable discard policy.

A node that processes the contents of an extension header MUST discard the corresponding packet if it contains any defined options that are not meant for the extension header being processed. This document requests IANA to add a new column to [[IANA-IPV6-PARAM](#)] to clearly mark the IPv6 Extension Header type(s) for which each option (defined by IETF Standards Action or IESG Approval) is valid.

A node that processes the contents of an IPv6 extension header MAY discard the corresponding packet if it contains any options that have become deprecated. Whether or not such packets are dropped SHOULD be configurable, and the default setting MUST be to not drop such packets.

A node that processes the contents of an extension header and encounters an undefined (unrecognised) IPv6 option MUST react to such option according to the highest-order two bits of the option type, as specified by [Section 4.2 of \[RFC2460\]](#).

A node that processes an IPv6 extension header MAY discard a packet containing any experimental IPv6 options.

#### **4. Processing of currently-defined IPv6 Options**

The following subsections provide advice on how to process the IPv6 options that have been defined at the time of this writing, according to the rules specified in the previous sections.

##### **[4.1.](#) Hop-by-Hop Options Header**

A node that processes the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header MUST discard the corresponding packet if it contains any options that are not valid for the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header [[IANA-IPV6-PARAM](#)].

A node that processes the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header MUST discard a packet containing multiple instances (i.e., more than one) of this option in the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header:

- o Type 0x05: Router Alert [[RFC2711](#)]





NOTE: The rationale for discarding the packet is that [[RFC2711](#)] forbids multiple instances of this option.

A node that processes the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header MUST discard a packet that carries a Fragment Header and also contains this option in the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header:

- o Type 0xC2: Jumbo Payload [[RFC2675](#)]

NOTE: The rationale for discarding the packet is that [[RFC2675](#)] forbids the use of the Jumbo Payload Option in packets that carry a Fragment Header.

A node that processes the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header MAY discard a packet containing any of the following options in that header:

- o Type=0x4D: Deprecated

NOTE: The rationale for discarding the packet is that the aforementioned option has been deprecated.

A node that processes the Hop-by-Hop Options extension header MAY discard a packet containing any of the following options in that header:

- o Type 0x1E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x3E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x5E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x7E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x9E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xBE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xDE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xFE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]

NOTE: This is in line with the corresponding specification in [[RFC7045](#)] for experimental extension headers.



## **4.2. Destination Options Header**

A node that processes the Destination Options header MUST discard a packet containing any options that are not valid for the Destination Options header [[IANA-IPV6-PARAM](#)].

A node that processes the Destination Options extension header MAY discard a packet containing any of the following options in that header:

- o Type 0x8A: Endpoint Identification [[nimrod-eid](#)] [[NIMROD-DOC](#)]
- o Type 0x4D: Deprecated

NOTE: The rationale for discarding the packet is that the aforementioned options have been deprecated.

A node that processes the Destination Options extension header MAY discard a packet containing any of the following options in that header:

- o Type 0x1E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x3E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x5E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x7E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0x9E: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xBE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xDE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]
- o Type 0xFE: [RFC3692](#)-style Experiment [[RFC4727](#)]

NOTE: This is in line with the corresponding specification in [[RFC7045](#)] for experimental extension headers.

## **5. IANA Considerations**

IANA is requested to add an extra column entitled "Extension Header Types" to the "Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options" registry [[IANA-IPV6-PARAM](#)], to clearly mark the IPv6 Extension Header types for which each option (defined by IETF Standards Action or IESG Approval) is valid (see the list below). This also applies to Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options defined in the future.



What follows is the initial list of IPv6 options and the corresponding marks that indicate which Extension Header type(s) these IPv6 options are valid for:

Hex Value	Description	Reference	EH Types
0x00	Pad1	[RFC2460]	DH
0x01	PadN	[RFC2460]	DH
0xC2	Jumbo Payload	[RFC2675]	H
0x63	RPL Option	[RFC6553]	H
0x04	Tunnel Encapsulation Limit	[RFC2473]	D
0x05	Router Alert	[RFC2711]	H
0x26	Quick-Start	[RFC4782]	H
0x07	CALIPSO	[RFC5570]	H
0x08	SMF_DPD	[RFC6621]	H
0xC9	Home Address	[RFC6275]	D
0x8A	Endpoint Identification	[nimrod-eid] [NIMROD-DOC]	D
0x8B	ILNP Nonce	[RFC6744]	D
0x8C	Line-Identification Option	[RFC6788]	D
0x4D	Deprecated		U
0x6D	MPL Option	[I-D.ietf-roll-trickle-mcast]	H
0xEE	IPv6 DFF Header	[RFC6971]	H
0x1E	RFC3692-style Experiment	[RFC4727]	DH



0x3E	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0x5E	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0x7E	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0x9E	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0xBE	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0xDE	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						
0xFE	<a href="#">RFC3692</a> -style		<a href="#">[RFC4727]</a>		DH	
	Experiment					
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+						

Additionally, the following legend should be added to the registry:

D: Destination Options Header  
H: Hop-by-Hop Options Header  
U: Unknown

## 6. Security Considerations

Forwarding nodes that operate as firewalls MUST conform to the requirements in this document. In particular, packets containing standard IPv6 options are only to be discarded as a result of an intentionally configured policy.

These requirements do not affect a firewall's ability to filter out traffic containing unwanted or suspect IPv6 options, if configured to do so. However, the changes do require firewalls to be capable of permitting any or all IPv6 options, if configured to do so. The default configurations are intended to allow normal use of any standard IPv6 option, avoiding the interoperability issues described in [Section 1](#) and [Section 3](#).

As noted above, the default configuration might discard packets containing experimental IPv6 options.





## 7. Acknowledgements

This document is heavily based on [[RFC7045](#)], authored by Brian Carpenter and Sheng Jiang.

The authors of this document would like to thank (in alphabetical order) Brian Carpenter, Mike Heard, and Jen Linkova, for providing valuable comments on earlier versions of this document.

## 8. References

### 8.1. Normative References

- [RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", STD 13, [RFC 1034](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1034, November 1987, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1034>>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC2205] Braden, R., Ed., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2205, September 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2205>>.
- [RFC2460] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2460, December 1998, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2460>>.
- [RFC2473] Conta, A. and S. Deering, "Generic Packet Tunneling in IPv6 Specification", [RFC 2473](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2473, December 1998, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2473>>.
- [RFC2675] Borman, D., Deering, S., and R. Hinden, "IPv6 Jumbograms", [RFC 2675](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2675, August 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2675>>.
- [RFC2710] Deering, S., Fenner, W., and B. Haberman, "Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6", [RFC 2710](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2710, October 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2710>>.
- [RFC2711] Partridge, C. and A. Jackson, "IPv6 Router Alert Option", [RFC 2711](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2711, October 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2711>>.



- [RFC3692] Narten, T., "Assigning Experimental and Testing Numbers Considered Useful", [BCP 82](#), [RFC 3692](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3692, January 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3692>>.
- [RFC4302] Kent, S., "IP Authentication Header", [RFC 4302](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4302, December 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4302>>.
- [RFC4303] Kent, S., "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", [RFC 4303](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4303, December 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4303>>.
- [RFC4304] Kent, S., "Extended Sequence Number (ESN) Addendum to IPsec Domain of Interpretation (DOI) for Internet Security Association and Key Management Protocol (ISAKMP)", [RFC 4304](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4304, December 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4304>>.
- [RFC4727] Fenner, B., "Experimental Values In IPv4, IPv6, ICMPv4, ICMPv6, UDP, and TCP Headers", [RFC 4727](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4727, November 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4727>>.
- [RFC4782] Floyd, S., Allman, M., Jain, A., and P. Sarolahti, "Quick-Start for TCP and IP", [RFC 4782](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4782, January 2007, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4782>>.
- [RFC5095] Abley, J., Savola, P., and G. Neville-Neil, "Deprecation of Type 0 Routing Headers in IPv6", [RFC 5095](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5095, December 2007, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5095>>.
- [RFC5201] Moskowitz, R., Nikander, P., Jokela, P., Ed., and T. Henderson, "Host Identity Protocol", [RFC 5201](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5201, April 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5201>>.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5226, May 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5226>>.
- [RFC5533] Nordmark, E. and M. Bagnulo, "Shim6: Level 3 Multihoming Shim Protocol for IPv6", [RFC 5533](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5533, June 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5533>>.



- [RFC5570] StJohns, M., Atkinson, R., and G. Thomas, "Common Architecture Label IPv6 Security Option (CALIPSO)", [RFC 5570](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5570, July 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5570>>.
- [RFC6275] Perkins, C., Ed., Johnson, D., and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [RFC 6275](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6275, July 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6275>>.
- [RFC6398] Le Faucheur, F., Ed., "IP Router Alert Considerations and Usage", [BCP 168](#), [RFC 6398](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6398, October 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6398>>.
- [RFC6550] Winter, T., Ed., Thubert, P., Ed., Brandt, A., Hui, J., Kelsey, R., Levis, P., Pister, K., Struik, R., Vasseur, JP., and R. Alexander, "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6550, March 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.
- [RFC6553] Hui, J. and JP. Vasseur, "The Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL) Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams", [RFC 6553](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6553, March 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6553>>.
- [RFC6554] Hui, J., Vasseur, JP., Culler, D., and V. Manral, "An IPv6 Routing Header for Source Routes with the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6554](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6554, March 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6554>>.
- [RFC6621] Macker, J., Ed., "Simplified Multicast Forwarding", [RFC 6621](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6621, May 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6621>>.
- [RFC6740] Atkinson, RJ. and SN. Bhatti, "Identifier-Locator Network Protocol (ILNP) Architectural Description", [RFC 6740](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6740, November 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6740>>.
- [RFC6744] Atkinson, RJ. and SN. Bhatti, "IPv6 Nonce Destination Option for the Identifier-Locator Network Protocol for IPv6 (ILNPv6)", [RFC 6744](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6744, November 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6744>>.



- [RFC6788] Krishnan, S., Kavanagh, A., Varga, B., Ooghe, S., and E. Nordmark, "The Line-Identification Option", [RFC 6788](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6788, November 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6788>>.
- [RFC6971] Herberg, U., Ed., Cardenas, A., Iwao, T., Dow, M., and S. Cespedes, "Depth-First Forwarding (DFF) in Unreliable Networks", [RFC 6971](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6971, June 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6971>>.
- [RFC7045] Carpenter, B. and S. Jiang, "Transmission and Processing of IPv6 Extension Headers", [RFC 7045](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7045, December 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7045>>.
- [RFC7112] Gont, F., Manral, V., and R. Bonica, "Implications of Oversized IPv6 Header Chains", [RFC 7112](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7112, January 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7112>>.

## **8.2. Informative References**

- [Biondi2007]  
Biondi, P. and A. Ebalard, "IPv6 Routing Header Security", CanSecWest 2007 Security Conference, 2007, <[http://www.secdev.org/conf/IPv6\\_RH\\_security-csw07.pdf](http://www.secdev.org/conf/IPv6_RH_security-csw07.pdf)>.
- [I-D.ietf-roll-trickle-mcast]  
Hui, J. and R. Kelsey, "Multicast Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (MPL)", [draft-ietf-roll-trickle-mcast-12](#) (work in progress), June 2015.
- [I-D.ietf-v6ops-ipv6-ehs-in-real-world]  
Gont, F., Linkova, J., Chown, T., and S. LIU, "Observations on IPv6 EH Filtering in the Real World", [draft-ietf-v6ops-ipv6-ehs-in-real-world-00](#) (work in progress), April 2015.
- [IANA-IPV6-PARAM]  
Internet Assigned Numbers Authority, "Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Parameters", December 2013, <<http://www.iana.org/assignments/ipv6-parameters/ipv6-parameters.xhtml>>.
- [NIMROD-DOC]  
Nimrod Documentation Page, ,  
<<http://ana-3.lcs.mit.edu/~jnc/nimrod/>>.





[nimrod-eid]

Lynn, C., "Endpoint Identifier Destination Option", IETF Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-nimrod-eid-00.txt](#), November 1995.

[RFC3871] Jones, G., Ed., "Operational Security Requirements for Large Internet Service Provider (ISP) IP Network Infrastructure", [RFC 3871](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3871, September 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3871>>.

[RFC7126] Gont, F., Atkinson, R., and C. Pignataro, "Recommendations on Filtering of IPv4 Packets Containing IPv4 Options", [BCP 186](#), [RFC 7126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7126, February 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7126>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Fernando Gont  
UTN-FRH / SI6 Networks  
Evaristo Carriego 2644  
Haedo, Provincia de Buenos Aires 1706  
Argentina

Phone: +54 11 4650 8472  
Email: [fgont@si6networks.com](mailto:fgont@si6networks.com)  
URI: <http://www.si6networks.com>

Will(Shucheng) Liu  
Huawei Technologies  
Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen 518129  
P.R. China

Email: [liushucheng@huawei.com](mailto:liushucheng@huawei.com)

Ronald P. Bonica  
Juniper Networks  
2251 Corporate Park Drive  
Herndon, VA 20171  
US

Phone: 571 250 5819  
Email: [rbonica@juniper.net](mailto:rbonica@juniper.net)

