

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Updates: [2330](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Informational
Expires: January 1, 2019

A. Morton
AT&T Labs
J. Fabini
TU Wien
N. Elkins
Inside Products, Inc.
M. Ackermann
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan
V. Hegde
Consultant
June 30, 2018

IPv6, IPv4 and Coexistence Updates for IPPM's Active Metric Framework
draft-ietf-ippm-2330-ipv6-06

Abstract

This memo updates the IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) Framework [RFC 2330](#) with new considerations for measurement methodology and testing. It updates the definition of standard-formed packets in [RFC 2330](#) to include IPv6 packets, deprecates the definition of minimal IP packet, and augments distinguishing aspects of packets, referred to as Type-P for test packets in [RFC 2330](#). This memo identifies that IPv4-IPv6 co-existence can challenge measurements within the scope of the IPPM Framework. Example use cases include, but are not limited to IPv4-IPv6 translation, NAT, or protocol encapsulation. IPv6 header compression and use of IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Area Networks (6LoWPAN) are considered and excluded from the standard-formed packet evaluation.

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.

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 <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Draft

IPPM IPv6 Update

June 2018

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 January 1, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://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.

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Scope	3
3.	Packets of Type-P	3
4.	Standard-Formed Packets	5
5.	NAT, IPv4-IPv6 Transition and Compression Techniques	8
6.	Security Considerations	10
7.	IANA Considerations	10

8.	Acknowledgements	10
9.	References	10
9.1.	Normative References	10
9.2.	Informative References	13
	Authors' Addresses	14

[1.](#) Introduction

The IETF IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) working group first created a framework for metric development in [[RFC2330](#)]. This framework has stood the test of time and enabled development of many fundamental metrics. It has been updated in the area of metric composition [[RFC5835](#)], and in several areas related to active stream measurement of modern networks with reactive properties [[RFC7312](#)].

The IPPM framework [[RFC2330](#)] recognized (in [section 13](#)) that many aspects of IP packets can influence its processing during transfer across the network.

In [Section 15 of \[RFC2330\]](#), the notion of a "standard-formed" packet is defined. However, the definition was never updated to include IPv6, as the original authors originally desired to do.

In particular, IPv6 Extension Headers and protocols which use IPv6 header compression are growing in use. This memo seeks to provide the needed updates.

[2.](#) Scope

The purpose of this memo is to expand the coverage of IPPM metrics to include IPv6, and to highlight additional aspects of test packets and make them part of the IPPM performance metric framework.

The scope is to update key sections of [[RFC2330](#)], adding considerations that will aid the development of new measurement methodologies intended for today's IP networks. Specifically, this memo expands the Type-P examples in [section 13 of \[RFC2330\]](#) and expands the definition (in [section 15 of \[RFC2330\]](#)) of a standard-formed packet to include IPv6 header aspects and other features.

Other topics in [[RFC2330](#)] which might be updated or augmented are deferred to future work. This includes the topics of passive and

various forms of hybrid active/passive measurements.

3. Packets of Type-P

A fundamental property of many Internet metrics is that the measured value of the metric depends on characteristics of the IP packet(s) used to make the measurement. Potential influencing factors include IP header fields and their values, but also higher-layer protocol headers and their values. Consider an IP-connectivity metric: one obtains different results depending on whether one is interested in connectivity for packets destined for well-known TCP ports or unreserved UDP ports, or those with invalid IPv4 checksums, or those

with TTL or Hop Limit of 16, for example. In some circumstances these distinctions will result in special treatment of packets in intermediate nodes and end systems (for example, if Diffserv [[RFC2474](#)], ECN [[RFC3168](#)], Router Alert [[RFC6398](#)], Hop-by-hop extensions [[RFC7045](#)], or Flow Labels [[RFC6437](#)] are used, or in the presence of firewalls or RSVP reservations).

Because of this distinction, we introduce the generic notion of a "packet of Type-P", where in some contexts P will be explicitly defined (i.e., exactly what type of packet we mean), partially defined (e.g., "with a payload of B octets"), or left generic. Thus we may talk about generic IP-Type-P-connectivity or more specific IP-port-HTTP-connectivity. Some metrics and methodologies may be fruitfully defined using generic Type-P definitions which are then made specific when performing actual measurements.

Whenever a metric's value depends on the type of the packets involved in the metric, the metric's name will include either a specific type or a phrase such as "Type-P". Thus we will not define an "IP-connectivity" metric but instead an "IP-Type-P-connectivity" metric and/or perhaps an "IP-port-HTTP-connectivity" metric. This naming convention serves as an important reminder that one must be conscious of the exact type of traffic being measured.

If the information constituting Type-P at the Source is found to have changed at the Destination (or at a measurement point between the Source and Destination, as in [[RFC5644](#)]), then the modified values MUST be noted and reported with the results. Some modifications occur according to the conditions encountered in transit (such as

congestion notification) or due to the requirements of segments of the Source to Destination path. For example, the packet length will change if IP headers are converted to the alternate version/address family, or if optional Extension Headers are added or removed. Even header fields like TTL/Hop Limit that typically change in transit may be relevant to specific tests. For example Neighbor Discovery Protocol (NDP) [[RFC4861](#)] packets are transmitted with Hop Limit value set to 255, and the validity test specifies that the Hop Limit MUST have a value of 255 at the receiver, too. So, while other tests may intentionally exclude the TTL/Hop Limit value from their Type-P definition, for this particular test the correct Hop Limit value is of high relevance and MUST be part of the Type-P definition.

Local policies in intermediate nodes based on examination of IPv6 Extension Headers may affect measurement repeatability. If intermediate nodes follow the recommendations of [[RFC7045](#)], repeatability may be improved to some degree.

A closely related note: it would be very useful to know if a given Internet component (like host, link, or path) treats equally a class C of different types of packets. If so, then any one of those types of packets can be used for subsequent measurement of the component. This suggests we devise a metric or suite of metrics that attempt to determine class C (a designation which has no relationship to address assignments, of course).

Load balancing over parallel paths is one particular example where such a class C would be more complex to determine in IPPM measurements. Load balancers and routers often use flow identifiers, computed as hashes of (specific parts of) the packet header, for deciding among the available parallel paths a packet will traverse. Packets with identical hashes are assigned to the same flow and forwarded to the same resource in the load balancer's (or router's) pool. The presence of a load balancer on the measurement path, as well as the specific headers and fields that are used for the forwarding decision, are not known when measuring the path as a black-box. Potential assessment scenarios include the measurement of one of the parallel paths, and the measurement of all available parallel paths that the load balancer can use. Knowledge of a load balancer's flow definition (alternatively: its class C specific

treatment in terms of header fields in scope of hash operations) is therefore a prerequisite for repeatable measurements. A path may have more than one stage of load balancing, adding to class C definition complexity.

4. Standard-Formed Packets

Unless otherwise stated, all metric definitions that concern IP packets include an implicit assumption that the packet is **standard-formed**. A packet is standard-formed if it meets all of the following REQUIRED criteria:

- + It includes a valid IP header: see below for version-specific criteria.
- + It is not an IP fragment.
- + The Source and Destination addresses correspond to the intended Source and Destination, including Multicast Destination addresses.
- + If a transport header is present, it contains a valid checksum and other valid fields.

For an IPv4 ([\[RFC0791\]](#) and updates) packet to be standard-formed, the following additional criteria are REQUIRED:

Morton, et al.	Expires January 1, 2019	[Page 5]
----------------	-------------------------	----------

Internet-Draft	IPPM IPv6 Update	June 2018
----------------	------------------	-----------

- o The version field is 4
- o The Internet Header Length (IHL) value is ≥ 5 ; the checksum is correct.
- o Its total length as given in the IPv4 header corresponds to the size of the IPv4 header plus the size of the payload.
- o Either the packet possesses sufficient TTL to travel from the Source to the Destination if the TTL is decremented by one at each hop, or it possesses the maximum TTL of 255.
- o It does not contain IP options unless explicitly noted.

For an IPv6 ([\[RFC8200\]](#) and updates) packet to be standard-formed, the

following criteria are REQUIRED:

- o The version field is 6.
- o Its total length corresponds to the size of the IPv6 header (40 octets) plus the length of the payload as given in the IPv6 header.
- o The payload length value for this packet (including Extension Headers) conforms to the IPv6 specifications.
- o Either the packet possesses sufficient Hop Limit to travel from the Source to the Destination if the Hop Limit is decremented by one at each hop, or it possesses the maximum Hop Limit of 255.
- o Either the packet does not contain IP Extension Headers, or it contains the correct number and type of headers as specified in the packet, and the headers appear in the standard-conforming order (Next Header).
- o All parameters used in the header and Extension Headers are found in the IANA Registry of Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Parameters, specified in [[IANA-6P](#)].

Two mechanisms require some discussion in the context of standard-formed packets, namely IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Area Networks (6LowPAN, [[RFC4944](#)]) and Robust Header Compression (ROHC, [[RFC3095](#)]). IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Area Networks (6LowPAN), as defined in [[RFC4944](#)] and updated by [[RFC6282](#)] with header compression and [[RFC6775](#)] with neighbor discovery optimizations, proposes solutions for using IPv6 in resource-constrained environments. An adaptation layer enables the transfer of IPv6 packets over networks having a MTU smaller than the minimum IPv6 MTU. Fragmentation and re-assembly of

IPv6 packets, as well as the resulting state that would be stored in intermediate nodes, poses substantial challenges to measurements. Likewise, ROHC operates statefully in compressing headers on subpaths, storing state in intermediate hosts. The modification of measurement packets' Type-P by ROHC and 6LowPAN, as well as requirements with respect to the concept of standard-formed packets for these two protocols requires substantial work. Because of these reasons we consider ROHC and 6LowPAN packets to be out of the scope

for the standard-formed packet evaluation.

The topic of IPv6 Extension Headers brings current controversies into focus as noted by [\[RFC6564\]](#) and [\[RFC7045\]](#). However, measurement use cases in the context of the IPPM framework like in-situ OAM [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#) in enterprise environments can benefit from inspection, modification, addition or deletion of IPv6 extension headers in hosts along the measurement path.

[\[RFC8250\]](#) endorses the use of IPv6 Destination Option for measurement purposes, consistent with other approved IETF specifications.

The following additional considerations apply when IPv6 Extension Headers are present:

- o Extension Header inspection: Some intermediate nodes may inspect Extension Headers or the entire IPv6 packet while in transit. In exceptional cases, they may drop the packet or route via a sub-optimal path, and measurements may be unreliable or unrepeatable. The packet (if it arrives) may be standard-formed, with a corresponding Type-P.
- o Extension Header modification: In Hop-by-Hop headers, some TLV encoded options may be permitted to change at intermediate nodes while in transit. The resulting packet may be standard-formed, with a corresponding Type-P.
- o Extension Header insertion or deletion: Although such behavior is not endorsed by current standards, it is possible that Extension Headers could be added to, or removed from the header chain. The resulting packet may be standard-formed, with a corresponding Type-P. This point simply encourages measurement system designers to be prepared for the unexpected, and to notify users when such events occur. There are issues with Extension Header insertion and deletion of course, such as exceeding the path MTU due to insertion, etc.
- o A change in packet length (from the corresponding packet observed at the Source) or header modification is a significant factor in

with the test results.

It is further REQUIRED that if a packet is described as having a "length of B octets", then $0 \leq B \leq 65535$; and if B is the payload length in octets, then $B \leq (65535 - \text{IP header size in octets, including any Extension Headers})$. The jumbograms defined in [\[RFC2675\]](#) are not covered by the above length analysis, but if the IPv6 Jumbogram Payload Hop-by-Hop Option Header is present, then a packet with corresponding length MUST be considered standard-formed. In practice, the path MTU will restrict the length of standard-formed packets that can successfully traverse the path. Path MTU Discovery for IP version 6 (PMTUD, [\[RFC8201\]](#)) or Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery (PLPMTUD, [\[RFC4821\]](#)) is recommended to prevent fragmentation.

So, for example, one might imagine defining an IP connectivity metric as "IP-type-P-connectivity for standard-formed packets with the IP Diffserv field set to 0", or, more succinctly, "IP-type-P-connectivity with the IP Diffserv Field set to 0", since standard-formed is already implied by convention. Changing the contents of a field, such as the Diffserv Code Point, ECN bits, or Flow Label may have a profound affect on packet handling during transit, but does not affect a packet's status as standard-formed. Likewise, the addition, modification, or deletion of extension headers may change the handling of packets in transit hosts.

[\[RFC2330\]](#) defines the "minimal IP packet from A to B" as a particular type of standard-formed packet often useful to consider. When defining IP metrics no packet smaller or simpler than this can be transmitted over a correctly operating IP network. However, the concept of the minimal IP packet has not been employed (since typical active measurement systems employ a transport layer and a payload) and its practical use is limited. Therefore, this memo deprecates the concept of the "minimal IP packet from A to B".

5. NAT, IPv4-IPv6 Transition and Compression Techniques

This memo adds the key considerations for utilizing IPv6 in two critical conventions of the IPPM Framework, namely packets of Type-P and standard-formed packets. The need for co-existence of IPv4 and IPv6 has originated transitioning standards like the Framework for IPv4/IPv6 Translation in [\[RFC6144\]](#) or IP/ICMP Translation Algorithms in [\[RFC7915\]](#) and [\[RFC7757\]](#).

The definition and execution of measurements within the context of the IPPM Framework is challenged whenever such translation mechanisms are present along the measurement path. In particular use cases like

IPv4-IPv6 translation, NAT, protocol encapsulation, or IPv6 header compression may result in modification of the measurement packet's Type-P along the path. All these changes MUST be reported. Example consequences include, but are not limited to:

- o Modification or addition of headers or header field values in intermediate nodes. IPv4-IPv6 transitioning or IPv6 header compression mechanisms may result in changes of the measurement packets' Type-P, too. Consequently, hosts along the measurement path may treat packets differently because of the Type-P modification. Measurements at observation points along the path may also need extra context to uniquely identify a packet.
- o Network Address Translators (NAT) on the path can have unpredictable impact on latency measurement (in terms of the amount of additional time added), and possibly other types of measurements. It is not usually possible to control this impact (as testers may not have any control of the underlying network or middleboxes). There is a possibility that stateful NAT will lead to unstable performance for a flow with specific Type-P, since state needs to be created for the first packet of a flow, and state may be lost later if the NAT runs out of resources. However, this scenario does not invalidate the Type-P for testing – for example the purpose of a test might be exactly to quantify the NAT's impact on delay variation. The presence of NAT may mean that the measured performance of Type-P will change between the source and the destination. This can cause an issue when attempting to correlate measurements conducted on segments of the path that include or exclude the NAT. Thus, it is a factor to be aware of when conducting measurements.
- o Variable delay due to internal state. One side effect of changes due to IPv4-IPv6 transitioning mechanisms is the variable delay that intermediate nodes spend for header modifications. Similar to NAT the allocation of internal state and establishment of context within intermediate nodes may cause variable delays, depending on the measurement stream pattern and position of a packet within the stream. For example the first packet in a stream will typically trigger allocation of internal state in an intermediate IPv4-IPv6 transition host. Subsequent packets can benefit from lower processing delay due to the existing internal state. However, large inter-packet delays in the measurement stream may result in the intermediate host deleting the associated state and needing to re-establish it on arrival of another stream packet. It is worth noting that this variable delay due to internal state allocation in intermediate nodes can be an explicit

use case for measurements.

- o Variable delay due to packet length. IPv4-IPv6 transitioning or header compression mechanisms modify the length of measurement packets. The modification of the packet size may or may not change the way how the measurement path treats the packets.

[6.](#) Security Considerations

The security considerations that apply to any active measurement of live paths are relevant here as well. See [\[RFC4656\]](#) and [\[RFC5357\]](#).

When considering privacy of those involved in measurement or those whose traffic is measured, the sensitive information available to potential observers is greatly reduced when using active techniques which are within this scope of work. Passive observations of user traffic for measurement purposes raise many privacy issues. We refer the reader to the privacy considerations described in the Large Scale Measurement of Broadband Performance (LMAP) Framework [\[RFC7594\]](#), which covers active and passive techniques.

[7.](#) IANA Considerations

This memo makes no requests of IANA.

[8.](#) Acknowledgements

The authors thank Brian Carpenter for identifying the lack of IPv6 coverage in IPPM's Framework, and for listing additional distinguishing factors for packets of Type-P. Both Brian and Fred Baker discussed many of the interesting aspects of IPv6 with the co-authors, leading to a more solid first draft: thank you both. Thanks to Bill Jouris for an editorial pass through the pre-00 text. As we completed our journey, Nevil Brownlee, Mike Heard, Spencer Dawkins, Warren Kumari, and Suresh Krishnan all contributed useful suggestions.

[9.](#) References

[9.1.](#) Normative References

- [RFC0791] Postel, J., "Internet Protocol", STD 5, [RFC 791](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC0791, September 1981, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc791>>.
- [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>>.

Morton, et al.

Expires January 1, 2019

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

IPPM IPv6 Update

June 2018

- [RFC2330] Paxson, V., Almes, G., Mahdavi, J., and M. Mathis, "Framework for IP Performance Metrics", [RFC 2330](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2330, May 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2330>>.
- [RFC2474] Nichols, K., Blake, S., Baker, F., and D. Black, "Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers", [RFC 2474](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2474, December 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2474>>.
- [RFC2675] Borman, D., Deering, S., and R. Hinden, "IPv6 Jumbograms", [RFC 2675](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2675, August 1999, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2675>>.
- [RFC3095] Bormann, C., Burmeister, C., Degermark, M., Fukushima, H., Hannu, H., Jonsson, L-E., Hakenberg, R., Koren, T., Le, K., Liu, Z., Martensson, A., Miyazaki, A., Svanbro, K., Wiebke, T., Yoshimura, T., and H. Zheng, "RObust Header Compression (ROHC): Framework and four profiles: RTP, UDP, ESP, and uncompressed", [RFC 3095](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3095, July 2001, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3095>>.
- [RFC3168] Ramakrishnan, K., Floyd, S., and D. Black, "The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP", [RFC 3168](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3168, September 2001, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3168>>.
- [RFC4656] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4656, September 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4656>>.

- [RFC4821] Mathis, M. and J. Heffner, "Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery", [RFC 4821](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4821, March 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4821>>.
- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 4861](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.
- [RFC4944] Montenegro, G., Kushalnagar, N., Hui, J., and D. Culler, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks", [RFC 4944](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4944, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4944>>.

Morton, et al.

Expires January 1, 2019

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

IPPM IPv6 Update

June 2018

- [RFC5357] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and J. Babiarz, "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5357, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5357>>.
- [RFC5644] Stephan, E., Liang, L., and A. Morton, "IP Performance Metrics (IPPM): Spatial and Multicast", [RFC 5644](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5644, October 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5644>>.
- [RFC5835] Morton, A., Ed. and S. Van den Berghe, Ed., "Framework for Metric Composition", [RFC 5835](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5835, April 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5835>>.
- [RFC6144] Baker, F., Li, X., Bao, C., and K. Yin, "Framework for IPv4/IPv6 Translation", [RFC 6144](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6144, April 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6144>>.
- [RFC6282] Hui, J., Ed. and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", [RFC 6282](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6282, September 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6282>>.
- [RFC6398] Le Faucheur, F., Ed., "IP Router Alert Considerations and Usage", [BCP 168](#), [RFC 6398](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6398, October

2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6398>>.

- [RFC6437] Amante, S., Carpenter, B., Jiang, S., and J. Rajahalme, "IPv6 Flow Label Specification", [RFC 6437](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6437, November 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6437>>.
- [RFC6564] Krishnan, S., Woodyatt, J., Kline, E., Hoagland, J., and M. Bhatia, "A Uniform Format for IPv6 Extension Headers", [RFC 6564](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6564, April 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6564>>.
- [RFC6775] Shelby, Z., Ed., Chakrabarti, S., Nordmark, E., and C. Bormann, "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", [RFC 6775](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6775, November 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6775>>.
- [RFC7045] Carpenter, B. and S. Jiang, "Transmission and Processing of IPv6 Extension Headers", [RFC 7045](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7045, December 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7045>>.

Morton, et al.

Expires January 1, 2019

[Page 12]

Internet-Draft

IPPM IPv6 Update

June 2018

- [RFC7312] Fabini, J. and A. Morton, "Advanced Stream and Sampling Framework for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", [RFC 7312](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7312, August 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7312>>.
- [RFC7757] Anderson, T. and A. Leiva Popper, "Explicit Address Mappings for Stateless IP/ICMP Translation", [RFC 7757](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7757, February 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7757>>.
- [RFC7915] Bao, C., Li, X., Baker, F., Anderson, T., and F. Gont, "IP/ICMP Translation Algorithm", [RFC 7915](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7915, June 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7915>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC8201] McCann, J., Deering, S., Mogul, J., and R. Hinden, Ed., "Path MTU Discovery for IP version 6", STD 87, [RFC 8201](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8201, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8201>>.
- [RFC8250] Elkins, N., Hamilton, R., and M. Ackermann, "IPv6 Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (PDM) Destination Option", [RFC 8250](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8250, September 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8250>>.

9.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., Pignataro, C., Gredler, H., Leddy, J., Youell, S., Mizrahi, T., Mozes, D., Lapukhov, P., Chang, R., daniel.bernier@bell.ca, d., and J. Lemon, "Data Fields for In-situ OAM", [draft-ietf-ippm-ioam-data-03](#) (work in progress), June 2018.
- [IANA-6P] IANA, "IANA Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Parameters", Internet Assigned Numbers Authority <https://www.iana.org/assignments/ipv6-parameters>, January 2018.

Morton, et al.	Expires January 1, 2019	[Page 13]
----------------	-------------------------	-----------

Internet-Draft	IPPM IPv6 Update	June 2018
----------------	------------------	-----------

- [RFC7594] Eardley, P., Morton, A., Bagnulo, M., Burbridge, T., Aitken, P., and A. Akhter, "A Framework for Large-Scale Measurement of Broadband Performance (LMAP)", [RFC 7594](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7594, September 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7594>>.

Authors' Addresses

Al Morton
 AT&T Labs
 200 Laurel Avenue South

Middletown, NJ 07748
USA

Phone: +1 732 420 1571
Fax: +1 732 368 1192
Email: acmorton@att.com
URI: <http://home.comcast.net/~acmacm/>

Joachim Fabini
TU Wien
Gusshausstrasse 25/E389
Vienna 1040
Austria

Phone: +43 1 58801 38813
Fax: +43 1 58801 38898
Email: Joachim.Fabini@tuwien.ac.at
URI: <http://www.tc.tuwien.ac.at/about-us/staff/joachim-fabini/>

Nalini Elkins
Inside Products, Inc.
Carmel Valley, CA 93924
USA

Email: nalini.elkins@insidethestack.com

Michael S. Ackermann
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan

Email: mackermann@bcbsm.com

INDIA

Phone: +91 9449834401

Email: vinayakh@gmail.com

URI: <http://www.vinayakhegde.com>