

Expires: December 27, 2003

IPv6 Node Requirements  
draft-ietf-ipv6-node-requirements-04.txt

### Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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>.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

### Abstract

This document defines requirements for IPv6 nodes. It is expected that IPv6 will be deployed in a wide range of devices and situations. Specifying the requirements for IPv6 nodes allows IPv6 to function well and interoperate in a large number of situations and deployments.

---

Internet-Draft

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction
    - 1.1 Scope of this Document
    - 1.2 Description of IPv6 Nodes & Conformance Groups
  2. Abbreviations Used in This Document
  3. Sub-IP Layer
    - 3.1 [RFC2464](#) - Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks
    - 3.2 [RFC2472](#) - IP version 6 over PPP
    - 3.3 [RFC2492](#) - IPv6 over ATM Networks
  4. IP Layer
    - 4.1 Internet Protocol Version 6 - [RFC2460](#)
    - 4.2 Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - [RFC2461](#)
    - 4.3 Path MTU Discovery & Packet Size
    - 4.4 ICMP for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) - [RFC2463](#)
    - 4.5 Addressing
    - 4.6 Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6 - [RFC2710](#)
  5. Transport and DNS
    - 5.1 Transport Layer
    - 5.2 DNS
    - 5.3 Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)
  6. IPv4 Support and Transition
    - 6.1 Transition Mechanisms
  7. Mobility
    - 7.1 Mobile IP
    - 7.2 Generic Packet Tunneling in IPv6 Specification - [RFC2473](#)
  8. Security
    - 8.1 Basic Architecture
    - 8.2 Security Protocols
    - 8.3 Transforms and Algorithms
    - 8.4 Key Management Methods
  9. Router Functionality
    - 9.1 General
  10. Network Management
    - 10.1 MIBs
  11. Security Considerations
  12. References
    - 12.1 Normative
    - 12.2 Non-Normative
  13. Authors and Acknowledgements
  14. Editor's Address
- Notices

---

Internet-Draft

## 1. Introduction

The goal of this document is to define the set of functionality required for an IPv6 node. Many IPv6 nodes will implement optional or additional features, but all IPv6 nodes can be expected to implement the mandatory requirements listed in this document.

This document tries to avoid discussion of protocol details, and references RFCs for this purpose. In case of any conflicting text, this document takes less precedence than the normative RFCs, unless additional clarifying text is included in this document.

During the process of writing this document, any issue raised regarding the normative RFCs, the consensus is, whenever possible, to fix the RFCs and not to add text in this document. However, it may be useful to include this information in an appendix for informative purposes.

Although the document points to different specifications, it should be noted that in most cases, the granularity of requirements are smaller than a single specification, as many specifications define multiple, independent pieces, some of which may not be mandatory.

As it is not always possible for an implementer to know the exact usage of IPv6 in a node, an overriding requirement for IPv6 nodes is that they should adhere to John Postel's Robustness Principle:

Be conservative in what you do, be liberal in what you accept from others. [[RFC793](#)].

### 1.1 Requirement Language

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 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC-2119](#)].

## 1.2 Scope of this Document

IPv6 covers many specifications. It is intended that IPv6 will be deployed in many different situations and environments. Therefore, it is important to develop the requirements for IPv6 nodes, in order to ensure interoperability.

This document assumes that all IPv6 nodes meet the minimum requirements specified here.

## 1.2 Description of IPv6 Nodes

Internet-Draft

From Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification [[RFC-2460](#)] we have the following definitions:

Description of an IPv6 Node

- a device that implements IPv6

Description of an IPv6 router

- a node that forwards IPv6 packets not explicitly addressed to itself.

Description of an IPv6 Host

- any node that is not a router.

## 2. Abbreviations Used in This Document

ATM Asynchronous Transfer Mode

AH Authentication Header

DAD Duplicate Address Detection

ESP Encapsulating Security Payload

ICMP Internet Control Message Protocol

IKE Internet Key Exchange

MIB Management Information Base  
MLD Multicast Listener Discovery  
MTU Maximum Transfer Unit  
NA Neighbor Advertisement  
NBMA Non-Broadcast Multiple Access  
ND Neighbor Discovery  
NS Neighbor Solicitation  
NUD Neighbor Unreachability Detection  
PPP Point-to-Point Protocol

## Internet-Draft

PVC Permanent Virtual Circuit  
SVC Switched Virtual Circuit  
ULP Upper Layer Protocol

### [3. Sub-IP Layer](#)

An IPv6 node must follow the RFC related to the link-layer that is sending packet. By definition, these specifications are required based upon what layer-2 is used. In general, it is reasonable to be a conformant IPv6 node and NOT support some legacy interfaces.

As IPv6 is run over new layer 2 technologies, it is expected that new specifications will be issued. This section highlights some major layer 2 technologies and is not intended to be complete.

#### [3.1 Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks - \[RFC2464\]\(#\)](#)

Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks [[RFC-2464](#)] MUST be supported for nodes supporting Ethernet interfaces.

### [3.2](#) IP version 6 over PPP - [RFC2472](#)

IPv6 over PPP [[RFC-2472](#)] MUST be supported for nodes that use PPP.

### [3.3](#) IPv6 over ATM Networks - [RFC2492](#)

IPv6 over ATM Networks [[RFC2492](#)] MUST be supported for nodes supporting ATM interfaces. Additionally, the specification states:

A minimally conforming IPv6/ATM driver SHALL support the PVC mode of operation. An IPv6/ATM driver that supports the full SVC mode SHALL also support PVC mode of operation.

## [4](#). IP Layer

### [4.1](#) Internet Protocol Version 6 - [RFC2460](#)

The Internet Protocol Version 6 is specified in [[RFC-2460](#)]. This specification MUST be supported.

Unrecognized options in Hop-by-Hop Options or Destination Options extensions MUST be processed as described in [RFC 2460](#).

The node MUST follow the packet transmission rules in [RFC 2460](#).

Nodes MUST always be able to receive fragment headers. However, if it

Internet-Draft

does not implement path MTU discovery it may not need to send fragment headers. However, nodes that do not implement transmission of fragment headers need to impose limitation to payload size of layer 4 protocols.

The capability of being a final destination MUST be supported, whereas the capability of being an intermediate destination MAY be supported (i.e. - host functionality vs. router functionality).

[RFC 2460](#) specifies extension headers and the processing for these headers.

A full implementation of IPv6 includes implementation of the following extension headers: Hop-by-Hop Options, Routing (Type 0), Fragment, Destination Options, Authentication and Encapsulating

Security Payload. [[RFC2460](#)]

An IPv6 node MUST be able to process these headers. It should be noted that there is some discussion about the use of Routing Headers and possible security threats [[IPv6-RH](#)] caused by them.

#### [4.2 Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - RFC2461](#)

Neighbor Discovery SHOULD be supported. [RFC 2461](#) states:

"Unless specified otherwise (in a document that covers operating IP over a particular link type) this document applies to all link types. However, because ND uses link-layer multicast for some of its services, it is possible that on some link types (e.g., NBMA links) alternative protocols or mechanisms to implement those services will be specified (in the appropriate document covering the operation of IP over a particular link type). The services described in this document that are not directly dependent on multicast, such as Redirects, Next-hop determination, Neighbor Unreachability Detection, etc., are expected to be provided as specified in this document. The details of how one uses ND on NBMA links is an area for further study."

Some detailed analysis of Neighbor discovery follows:

Router Discovery is how hosts locate routers that reside on an attached link. Router Discovery MUST be supported for implementations. However, an implementation MAY support disabling this function.

Prefix Discovery is how hosts discover the set of address prefixes that define which destinations are on-link for an attached link. Prefix discovery MUST be supported for implementations. However, the

implementation MAY support the option of disabling this function.

Neighbor Unreachability Detection (NUD) MUST be supported for all paths between hosts and neighboring nodes. It is not required for paths between routers. It is required for multicast. However, when a node receives a unicast Neighbor Solicitation (NS) message (that may be a NUD's NS), the node MUST respond to it (i.e. send a unicast Neighbor Advertisement).

Duplicate Address Detection MUST be supported ([RFC2462 section 5.4](#) specifies DAD MUST take place on all unicast addresses).

Sending Router Solicitation MUST be supported for host implementation, but MAY support a configuration option to disable this functionality.

Receiving and processing Router Advertisements MUST be supported for host implementations. However, the implementation MAY support the option of disabling this function. The ability to understand specific Router Advertisements is dependent on supporting the specification where the RA is specified.

Sending and Receiving Neighbor Solicitation (NS) and Neighbor Advertisement (NA) MUST be supported. NS and NA messages are required for Duplicate Address Detection (DAD).

Redirect Function SHOULD be supported. If the node is a router, Redirect Function MUST be supported.

### [4.3](#) Path MTU Discovery & Packet Size

#### [4.3.1](#) Path MTU Discovery - [RFC1981](#)

Path MTU Discovery [[RFC-1981](#)] MAY be supported. Nodes with a link MTU larger than the minimum IPv6 link MTU (1280 octets) can use Path MTU Discovery in order to discover the real path MTU. The relative overhead of IPv6 headers is minimized through the use of longer packets, thus making better use of the available bandwidth.

The IPv6 specification [[RFC-2460](#)] states in chapter 5 that "a minimal IPv6 implementation (e.g., in a boot ROM) may simply restrict itself to sending packets no larger than 1280 octets, and omit implementation of Path MTU Discovery."

If Path MTU Discovery is not implemented then the sending packet size is limited to 1280 octets (standard limit in [[RFC-2460](#)]). However, if this is done, the host MUST be able to receive packets with size up to the link MTU before reassembly. This is because the node at the

accepted.

#### [4.3.2 IPv6 Jumbograms - RFC2675](#)

IPv6 Jumbograms [[RFC2675](#)] MAY be supported.

#### [4.4 ICMP for the Internet Protocol Version 6 \(IPv6\) - RFC2463](#)

ICMPv6 [[RFC-2463](#)] MUST be supported.

#### [4.5 Addressing](#)

Currently, there is discussion on-going on support for site-local addressing.

##### [4.5.1 IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture - RFC2373](#)

The IPv6 Addressing Architecture [[RFC-2373](#)] MUST be supported. Currently, this specification is being updated by [[ADDRARCHv3](#)].

##### [4.5.2 IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration - RFC2462](#)

IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration is defined in [[RFC-2462](#)]. This specification MUST be supported for nodes that are hosts.

Nodes that are routers MUST be able to generate link local addresses as described in this specification.

From 2462:

The autoconfiguration process specified in this document applies only to hosts and not routers. Since host autoconfiguration uses information advertised by routers, routers will need to be configured by some other means. However, it is expected that routers will generate link-local addresses using the mechanism described in this document. In addition, routers are expected to successfully pass the Duplicate Address Detection procedure described in this document on all addresses prior to assigning them to an interface.

Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) MUST be supported.

##### [4.5.3 Privacy Extensions for Address Configuration in IPv6 - RFC3041](#)

Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [[RFC-3041](#)] SHOULD be supported. It is recommended that this behavior be configurable on a connection basis within each application when

---

Internet-Draft

available. It is noted that a number of applications do not work with addresses generated with this method, while other applications work quite well with them.

#### [4.5.4](#) Default Address Selection for IPv6

Default Address Selection for IPv6 [[DEFADDR](#)] SHOULD be supported, if a node has more than one IPv6 address per interface or a node has more than one IPv6 interface (physical or logical) configured.

If supported, the rules specified in the document MUST be implemented. A node needs to belong to one site, however there is no requirement that a node be able to belong to more than one site.

This draft has been approved as a proposed standard.

#### [4.5.5](#) Stateful Address Autoconfiguration

Stateful Address Autoconfiguration MAY be supported. DHCP [[DHCPv6](#)] is the standard stateful address configuration protocol, see [section 5.3](#) for DHCPv6 support.

For nodes which do not support Stateful Address Autoconfiguration, the node may be unable to obtain any IPv6 addresses aside from link-local addresses when it receives a router advertisement with the 'M' flag (Managed address configuration) set and which contains no prefixes advertised for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (see [section 4.5.2](#)).

#### [4.6](#) Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6 - [RFC2710](#)

Multicast Listener Discovery [[RFC-2710](#)] MUST be supported by nodes supporting multicast applications. A primary IPv6 multicast application is Neighbor Discovery (all those solicited-node mcast addresses must be joined).

When MLDv2 [[MLDv2](#)] has been completed, it SHOULD take precedence over MLD.

### [5](#). Transport Layer and DNS

#### [5.1](#) Transport Layer

##### [5.1.1](#) TCP and UDP over IPv6 Jumbograms - [RFC2147](#)

This specification MUST be supported if jumbograms are implemented

[[RFC-2675](#)]. One open issue is if this document needs to be updated, as it refers to an obsoleted document.

Internet-Draft

## [5.2](#) DNS

DNS, as described in [[RFC-1034](#)], [[RFC-1035](#)], [[RFC-1886](#)], [[RFC-3152](#)] and [[RFC-3363](#)] MAY be supported. Not all nodes will need to resolve addresses. Note that [RFC 1886](#) is currently being updated [[RFC-1886-BIS](#)].

### [5.2.2](#) Format for Literal IPv6 Addresses in URL's - [RFC2732](#)

[RFC 2732](#) MUST be supported if applications on the node use URL's.

## [5.3](#) Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)

### [5.3.1](#) Managed Address Configuration

An IPv6 node that does not include an implementation of DHCP will be unable to obtain any IPv6 addresses aside from link-local addresses when it is connected to a link over which it receives a router advertisement with the 'M' flag (Managed address configuration) set and which contains no prefixes advertised for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (see [section 4.5.2](#)). An IPv6 node that receives a router advertisement with the 'M' flag set and that contains advertised prefixes will configure interfaces with both stateless autoconfiguration addresses and addresses obtained through DHCP.

For those IPv6 Nodes that implement DHCP, those nodes MUST use DHCP upon the receipt of a Router Advertisement with the 'M' flag set (see [section 5.5.3 of RFC2462](#)). In addition, in the absence of a router, IPv6 Nodes that implement DHCP MUST attempt to use DHCP.

An IPv6 node that does not include an implementation of DHCP will be unable to dynamically obtain any IPv6 addresses aside from link-local addresses when it is connected to a link over which it receives a router advertisement with the 'M' flag (Managed address configuration) set and which contains no prefixes advertised for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (see [section 4.5.2](#)). In this situation, the IPv6 Node will be unable to communicate with other off-link nodes unless a global or site-local IPv6 address is manually configured.

### [5.3.2](#) Other stateful configuration

DHCP provides the ability to provide other configuration information to the node. An IPv6 node that does not include an implementation of DHCP will be unable to obtain other configuration information such as the addresses of DNS servers when it is connected to a link over which the node receives a router advertisement in which the 'O' flag ("Other stateful configuration") is set.

Internet-Draft

For those IPv6 Nodes that implement DHCP, those nodes MUST use DHCP upon the receipt of a Router Advertisement with the 'O' flag set (see [section 5.5.3 of RFC2462](#)). In addition, in the absence of a router, hosts that implement DHCP MUST attempt to use DHCP. For IPv6 Nodes that do not implement DHCP, the 'O' flag of a Router Advertisement can be ignored. Furthermore, in the absence of a router, this type of node is not required to initiate DHCP.

## [6.](#) IPv4 Support and Transition

IPv6 nodes MAY support IPv4.

### [6.1](#) Transition Mechanisms

IPv6 nodes SHOULD use native address instead of transition-based addressing.

#### [6.1.1](#) Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers - [RFC2893](#)

If an IPv6 node implement dual stack and/or tunneling, then [RFC2893](#) MUST be supported.

This document is currently being updated.

## [7.](#) Mobility

### [7.1](#) Mobile IP

Mobile IPv6 [[MIPv6](#)] specification defines requirements for the following types of nodes:

- mobile nodes

- correspondent nodes with support for route optimization
- home agents
- all IPv6 routers

Hosts MAY support mobile node functionality.

Hosts SHOULD support route optimization requirements for correspondent nodes. Routers do not need to support route optimization.

Routers SHOULD support mobile IP requirements.

## [7.2](#) Securing Signaling between Mobile Nodes and Home Agents

The security mechanisms described in [\[MIPv6-HASEC\]](#) MUST be supported by nodes implementing mobile node or home agent functionality

Internet-Draft

specified in Mobile IP [\[MIPv6\]](#).

## 7.3 Generic Packet Tunneling in IPv6 Specification - [RFC2473](#)

Generic Packet Tunneling [\[RFC-2473\]](#) MUST be supported for nodes implementing mobile node functionality or Home Agent functionality of Mobile IP [\[MIPv6\]](#).

## [8](#). Security

This section describes the specification of IPsec for the IPv6 node. Other issues that IPsec cannot resolve are described in the security considerations.

### [8.1](#) Basic Architecture

Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol [\[RFC-2401\]](#) MUST be supported.

### [8.2](#) Security Protocols

ESP [\[RFC-2406\]](#) MUST be supported. AH [\[RFC-2402\]](#) MUST be supported.

### [8.3](#) Transforms and Algorithms

Current IPsec RFCs specify the support of certain transforms and algorithms, NULL encryption, DES-CBC, HMAC-SHA-1-96, and HMAC-MD5-96. The requirements for these are discussed first, and then additional algorithms 3DES-CBC, AES-128-CBC, and HMAC-SHA-256-96 are discussed.

NULL encryption algorithm [[RFC-2410](#)] MUST be supported for providing integrity service and also for debugging use.

The "ESP DES-CBC Cipher Algorithm With Explicit IV" [[RFC-2405](#)] SHOULD NOT be supported. Security issues related to the use of DES are discussed in [[DESDIFF](#)], [[DESINT](#)], [[DESCRACK](#)]. It is still listed as required by the existing IPsec RFCs, but as it is currently viewed as an inherently weak algorithm, and no longer fulfills its intended role.

The NULL authentication algorithm [[RFC-2406](#)] MUST be supported within ESP. The use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 within AH and ESP, described in [[RFC-2404](#)] MUST be supported. The Use of HMAC-MD5-96 within AH and ESP, described in [[RFC-2403](#)] MUST be supported. An implementer MUST refer to Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication [[RFC-2104](#)].

3DES-CBC does not suffer from the issues related to DES-CBC. 3DES-CBC and ESP CBC-Mode Cipher Algorithms [[RFC2451](#)] MAY be supported. AES-

Internet-Draft

128-CBC [[ipsec-ciph-aes-cbc](#)] MUST be supported, as it is expected to be a widely available, secure algorithm that is required for interoperability. It is not required by the current IPsec RFCs, however.

The "HMAC-SHA-256-96 Algorithm and Its Use With IPsec" [[ipsec-ciph-sha-256](#)] MAY be supported.

#### [8.4](#) Key Management Methods

Manual keying MUST be supported

IKE [[RFC-2407](#)] [[RFC-2408](#)] [[RFC-2409](#)] MAY be supported for unicast traffic. Where key refresh, anti-replay features of AH and ESP, or on-demand creation of SAs is required, automated keying MUST be supported. Note that the IPsec WG is working on the successor to IKE [[SOI](#)]. Key management methods for multicast traffic are also being worked on by the MSEC WG.

## [9. Router Functionality](#)

This section defines general considerations for IPv6 nodes that act as routers. It is for future study if this document, or a separate document is needed to fully define IPv6 router requirements. Currently, this section does not discuss routing protocols.

### [9.1 General](#)

#### [9.1.1 IPv6 Router Alert Option - \[RFC2711\]\(#\)](#)

The Router Alert Option [[RFC-2711](#)] MUST be supported by nodes that perform packet forwarding at the IP layer (i.e. - the node is a router).

#### [9.1.2 Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - \[RFC2461\]\(#\)](#)

Sending Router Advertisements and processing Router Solicitation MUST be supported.

## [10. Network Management](#)

Network Management, MAY be supported by IPv6 nodes. However, for IPv6 nodes that are embedded devices, network management may be the only possibility to control these hosts.

### [10.1 MIBs](#)

## Internet-Draft

In a general sense, MIBs SHOULD be supported by nodes that support a SNMP agent.

#### [10.1.1 IP Forwarding Table MIB](#)

Support for this MIB does not imply that IPv4 or IPv4 specific portions of this MIB be supported.

#### [10.1.2 Management Information Base for the Internet Protocol \(IP\)](#)

Support for this MIB does not imply that IPv4 or IPv4 specific

portions of this MIB be supported.

## 11. Security Considerations

This draft does not affect the security of the Internet, but implementations of IPv6 are expected to support a minimum set of security features to ensure security on the Internet. "IP Security Document Roadmap" [[RFC-2411](#)] is important for everyone to read.

The security considerations in [RFC2460](#) describes the following:

The security features of IPv6 are described in the Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol [[RFC-2401](#)].

For example, specific protocol documents and applications may require the use of additional security mechanisms.

The use of ICMPv6 without IPsec can expose the nodes in question to various kind of attacks including Denial-of-Service, Impersonation, Man-in-the-Middle, and others. Note that only manually keyed IPsec can protect some of the ICMPv6 messages that are related to establishing communications. This is due to chicken-and-egg problems on running automated key management protocols on top of IP. However, manually keyed IPsec may require a large number of SAs in order to run on a large network due to the use of many addresses during ICMPv6 Neighbor Discovery.

The use of wide-area multicast communications has an increased risk from specific security threats, compared with the same threats in unicast [[MC-THREAT](#)].

An implementer should also consider the analysis of anycast [[ANYCAST](#)].

## 12. References

### 12.1 Normative

Loughney (editor)

June 27, 2003

[Page 14]

---

Internet-Draft

[ADDRARCHv3] Hinden, R. and Deering, S. "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 3513](#), April 2003.

[DEFADDR] Draves, R., "Default Address Selection for IPv6", [RFC](#)

[3484](#), February 2003.

- [DHCPv6] Bound, J. et al., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", Work in progress.
- [MIPv6] Johnson D. and Perkins, C., "Mobility Support in IPv6", Work in progress.
- [MIPv6-HASEC] J. Arkko, V. Devarapalli, F. Dupont, "Using IPsec to Protect Mobile IPv6 Signaling between Mobile Nodes and Home Agents", Work in Progress.
- [MLDv2] Vida, R. et al., "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", Work in Progress.
- [RFC-1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, [RFC 1035](#), November 1987.
- [RFC-1886] Thomson, S. et al. and Huitema, C., "DNS Extensions to support IP version 6", [RFC 1886](#), December 1995.
- [RFC-1886-BIS] Thomson, S., et al., "DNS Extensions to support IP version 6" Work In Progress.
- [RFC-1981] McCann, J., Mogul, J. and Deering, S., "Path MTU Discovery for IP version 6", [RFC 1981](#), August 1996.
- [RFC-2096-BIS] Wasserman, M. (ed), "IP Forwarding Table MIB", Work in Progress.
- [RFC-2011-BIS] Routhier, S (ed), "Management Information Base for the Internet Protocol (IP)", Work in progress.
- [RFC-2104] Krawczyk, K., Bellare, M., and Canetti, R., "HMAC: Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication", [RFC 2104](#), February 1997.
- [RFC-2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC-2373] Hinden, R. and Deering, S., "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 2373](#), July 1998.

## Internet-Draft

- [RFC-2401] Kent, S. and Atkinson, R., "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", [RFC 2401](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2402] Kent, S. and Atkinson, R., "IP Authentication Header", [RFC 2402](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2403] Madson, C., and Glenn, R., "The Use of HMAC-MD5 within ESP and AH", [RFC 2403](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2404] Madson, C., and Glenn, R., "The Use of HMAC-SHA-1 within ESP and AH", [RFC 2404](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2405] Madson, C. and Doraswamy, N., "The ESP DES-CBC Cipher Algorithm With Explicit IV", [RFC 2405](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2406] Kent, S. and Atkinson, R., "IP Encapsulating Security Protocol (ESP)", [RFC 2406](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2407] Piper, D., "The Internet IP Security Domain of Interpretation for ISAKMP", [RFC 2407](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2408] Maughan, D., Schertler, M., Schneider, M., and Turner, J., "Internet Security Association and Key Management Protocol (ISAKMP)", [RFC 2408](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2409] Harkins, D., and Carrel, D., "The Internet Key Exchange (IKE)", [RFC 2409](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2410] Glenn, R. and Kent, S., "The NULL Encryption Algorithm and Its Use With IPsec", [RFC 2410](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2451] Pereira, R. and Adams, R., "The ESP CBC-Mode Cipher Algorithms", [RFC 2451](#), November 1998.
- [RFC-2460] Deering, S. and Hinden, R., "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), December 1998.
- [RFC-2461] Narten, T., Nordmark, E. and Simpson, W., "Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2461](#), December 1998.
- [RFC-2462] Thomson, S. and Narten, T., "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", [RFC 2462](#).
- [RFC-2463] Conta, A. and Deering, S., "ICMP for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2463](#), December 1998.

[RFC-2472] Haskin, D. and Allen, E., "IP version 6 over PPP", RFC

Loughney (editor)

June 27, 2003

[Page 16]

---

Internet-Draft

2472, December 1998.

[RFC-2473] Conta, A. and Deering, S., "Generic Packet Tunneling in IPv6 Specification", [RFC 2473](#), December 1998.

[RFC-2710] Deering, S., Fenner, W. and Haberman, B., "Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6", [RFC 2710](#), October 1999.

[RFC-2711] Partridge, C. and Jackson, A., "IPv6 Router Alert Option", [RFC 2711](#), October 1999.

[RFC-3041] Narten, T. and Draves, R., "Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration in IPv6", [RFC 3041](#), January 2001.

[RFC-3152] Bush, R., "Delegation of IP6.ARPA", [RFC 3152](#), August 2001.

[RFC-3363] Bush, R., et al., "Representing Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) Addresses in the Domain Name System (DNS)", [RFC 3363](#), August 2002.

## [12.2](#) Non-Normative

[ANYCAST] Hagino, J and Ettikan K., "An Analysis of IPv6 Anycast" Work in Progress.

[DESDIFF] Biham, E., Shamir, A., "Differential Cryptanalysis of DES-like cryptosystems", Journal of Cryptology Vol 4, Jan 1991.

[DESCRACK] Cracking DES, O'Reilly & Associates, Sebastapol, CA 2000.

[DESINT] Bellovin, S., "An Issue With DES-CBC When Used Without Strong Integrity", Proceedings of the 32nd IETF, Danvers, MA, April 1995.

[MC-THREAT] Ballardie A. and Crowcroft, J.; Multicast-Specific Security Threats and Counter-Measures; In Proceedings "Sympos-

sium on Network and Distributed System Security", February 1995, pp.2-16.

- [SOI] C. Madson, "Son-of-IKE Requirements", Work in Progress.
- [RFC-793] Postel, J., "Transmission Control Protocol", [RFC 793](#), August 1980.

#### Internet-Draft

- [RFC-1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", [RFC 1034](#), November 1987.
- [RFC-2147] Borman, D., "TCP and UDP over IPv6 Jumbograms", [RFC 2147](#), May 1997.
- [RFC-2464] Crawford, M., "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks", [RFC 2462](#), December 1998.
- [RFC-2492] G. Armitage, M. Jork, P. Schulter, G. Harter, "IPv6 over ATM Networks", [RFC 2492](#), January 1999.
- [RFC-2675] Borman, D., Deering, S. and Hinden, B., "IPv6 Jumbograms", [RFC 2675](#), August 1999.
- [RFC-2732] R. Hinden, B. Carpenter, L. Masinter, "Format for Literal IPv6 Addresses in URL's", [RFC 2732](#), December 1999.
- [RFC-2851] M. Daniele, B. Haberman, S. Routhier, J. Schoenwaelder, "Textual Conventions for Internet Network Addresses", [RFC2851](#), June 2000.
- [RFC-2893] Gilligan, R. and Nordmark, E., "Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers", [RFC 2893](#), August 2000.
- [RFC-3019] B. Haberman, R. Worzella, "IP Version 6 Management Information Base for the Multicast Listener Discovery Protocol", [RFC3019](#), January 2001.
- [IPv6-RH] P. Savola, "Security of IPv6 Routing Header and Home Address Options", Work in Progress, March 2002.

This document was written by the IPv6 Node Requirements design team:

Jari Arkko  
[jari.arkko@ericsson.com]

Marc Blanchet  
[marc.blanchet@viagenie.qc.ca]

Samita Chakrabarti  
[samita.chakrabarti@eng.sun.com]

Alain Durand  
[alain.durand@sun.com]

Loughney (editor)

June 27, 2003

[Page 18]

---

Internet-Draft

Gerard Gastaud  
[gerard.gastaud@alcatel.fr]

Jun-ichiro itojun Hagino  
[itojun@iijlab.net]

Atsushi Inoue  
[inoue@isl.rdc.toshiba.co.jp]

Masahiro Ishiyama  
[masahiro@isl.rdc.toshiba.co.jp]

John Loughney  
[john.loughney@nokia.com]

Okabe Nobuo  
[nov@tahi.org]

Rajiv Raghunarayan  
[raraghun@cisco.com]

Shoichi Sakane  
[shoichi.sakane@jp.yokogawa.com]

Dave Thaler  
[dthaler@windows.microsoft.com]

Juha Wiljakka  
[juha.wiljakka@Nokia.com]

The authors would like to thank Ran Atkinson, Jim Bound, Brian Carpenter, Ralph Droms, Christian Huitema, Adam Machalek, Thomas Narten, Juha Ollila and Pekka Savola for their comments.

#### 14. Editor's Contact Information

Comments or questions regarding this document should be sent to the IPv6 Working Group mailing list (ipng@sunroof.eng.sun.com) or to:

John Loughney  
Nokia Research Center  
Itämerenkatu 11-13  
00180 Helsinki  
Finland

Phone: +358 50 483 6242  
Email: John.Loughney@Nokia.com

Loughney (editor)

June 27, 2003

[Page 19]

---

Internet-Draft

#### Notices

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights, which may cover technology that may be required to practice

this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.