

Internet Draft
[draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-icmpv6-00.txt](#)
Category: Experimental
Expires: 09 JUL 2012

RJ Atkinson
Consultant
S Bhatti
U. St Andrews
January 9, 2012

ICMP Locator Update message for ILNPv6
[draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-icmpv6-00.txt](#)

Status of this Memo

Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

Copyright (c) 2012 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.

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

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. This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, except to publish it as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

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/lid-abstracts.html>

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

This document is not on the IETF standards-track and does not specify any level of standard. This document merely provides information for the Internet community.

This document is part of the ILNP document set, which has had extensive review within the IRTF Routing Research Group. ILNP is one of the recommendations made by the RG Chairs. Separately, various refereed research papers on ILNP have also been published during this decade. So the ideas contained herein have had much broader review than the IRTF Routing RG. The views in this document were considered controversial by the Routing RG, but the RG reached a consensus that the document still should be published. The Routing RG has had remarkably little consensus on anything, so virtually all Routing RG outputs are considered controversial.

Abstract

This note specifies an experimental ICMPv6 message type used with the Identifier-Locator Network Protocol (ILNP). This message is used to dynamically update Identifier/Locator bindings for an existing ILNP session. This is a product of the IRTF Routing RG.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Syntax.....	3
3. Transport Protocol Effects.....	5
4. Implementation Considerations.....	5
5. Backwards Compatibility.....	6
6. Security Considerations	6
7. IANA Considerations	7
8. References	7

Atkinson & Bhatti Expires in 6 months

[Page 2]

1. Introduction

At present, the research and development community are examining various alternatives for evolving the Internet Architecture. Several different classes of evolution are being considered. One class is often called "Map and Encapsulate", where traffic would be mapped and then tunnelled through the inter-domain core of the Internet. Another class being considered is sometimes known as "Identifier/Locator Split". This document relates to a proposal that is in the latter class of evolutionary approaches.

The Identifier Locator Network Protocol evolves the current Internet Architecture by deprecating the concept of the IP Address, and substituting separate Locator and Identifier objects, each with crisp syntax and semantics [[ILNP-ARCH](#)].

ILNP has multiple instantiations. [[ILNP-ENG](#)] discusses ILNP engineering and implementation aspects common to all instantiations of ILNP. This document focuses on ILNP for IPv6 (ILNPv6). [[ILNP-DNS](#)] covers new Domain Name System (DNS) resource records used with ILNP. [[ILNP-Nonce](#)] describes a Nonce Destination Option used with ILNPv6.

The new ICMPv6 Locator Update message described in this document enables an ILNP-capable node to update its correspondents about the currently valid set of Locators valid to use in reaching the node sending this message. [[RFC 2460](#)] [[RFC 4443](#)]

This new ICMPv6 message MUST ONLY be used for ILNPv6 sessions. Authentication is always required, as described in the Security Considerations section later in this note.

Some might consider any and all use of ICMP to be undesirable. In that context, please note that while this specification uses ICMP, on grounds that this is a control message, there is no architectural difference between using ICMP and using some different framing, for example UDP.

1.1 Terminology

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](#)]

2. Syntax

Example ICMP message body for case where only 1 Locator value is being indicated:

Atkinson & Bhatti Expires in 6 months

[Page 3]

Num of Locs:	This field contains the number of 64-bit Locators that follow the RESERVED field. This field must not contain the number zero, as each ILNP node needs to be reachable via at least 1 Locator value. Multi-homed nodes will have at least 2 Locator values.
--------------	---

Atkinson & Bhatti Expires in 6 months

[Page 4]

Reserved: These fields MUST be sent as zero.
 At this time, recipients should ignore the
 contents of these field, as these bits are
 reserved for future use. (Implementers
 should understand that these fields might
 be used in the future.)

Locator: This 64-bit field contains a valid Locator
 that can be used to reach the sending node.
 A variable number of Locator fields are
 concatenated one after another. These are
 listed in priority order, with the first
 Locator field containing the most preferred
 Locator value.

Preference: A 16-bit unsigned integer which specifies
 the preference given to this Locator among
 other Locators in the same ICMP message.
 Lower Preference values are preferred
 over higher Preference values.

NOTE: In order to prevent session stealing by an off-path adversary, all ICMP Locator Update packets MUST also contain an ILNP Nonce Destination Option with valid authentication information for the session associated with the ICMP Locator Update packet. The ILNP Nonce Destination Option is required in all cases, even if some other authentication mechanism, such as Security for ILNP [[ILNP-ENG](#)] [[RFC 4301](#)], is also in use.

3. Transport Protocol Effects

This message has no impact on any transport protocol.

The message may affect where packets for a given transport session are sent, but an ILNP design objective is to decouple transport-protocols from network-layer changes.

4. Implementation Considerations

Implementers may use any internal implementation they wish, provided that the external appearance is the same as this implementation approach.

To support ILNPv6, and to retain the incremental deployability and backwards compatibility needed, the network layer needs a mode bit in the Transport Control Block (or its equivalent) to

track which IP sessions are using the classic IPv6 mode and which IP sessions are using the Identifier/Locator Split mode.

Further, when supporting ILNPv6, nodes will need to retain a Correspondent Cache in the network layer as described in [[ILNP-ENG](#)].

A node sending an ICMP Locator Update message MUST include all currently valid Locator values in that message. A node receiving a valid ICMP Locator Update message MUST replace the previously current set of Locator values for that correspondent node in the ILNP Correspondent Cache with the newly received set of Locator values.

Every implementation needs to support a large number of Locator values being sent or received in a single ICMP Locator Update message, because a multi-homed node or multi-homed site might have a large number of upstream links to different service providers, each with its own Locator value.

5. Backwards Compatibility

For all sessions operating in Identifier/Locator Split mode, inside each node the high-order 64-bits ("Locator") MUST be set to zero before calculating TCP or UDP checksums. So, any changes in Locator values used on the wire will be invisible to the transport protocol. In this mode, transport-layer checksums (e.g. TCP pseudo-header checksum) will be calculated with both Source Locator and Destination Locator fields set to all zero.

When ILNPv6 is not in use, the receiving IPv6 mode MUST discard the ICMP Locator Update packet without processing the packet.

6. Security Considerations

A broader discussion of ILNP Security Considerations is found in [[ILNP-ARCH](#)], and is incorporated here by reference.

The ICMP Locator Update message MUST ONLY be used for ILNPv6 sessions.

The ILNP Nonce Destination Option [[ILNP-Nonce](#)] MUST be present in packets containing an ICMPv6 Locator Update message. Further, the received Nonce Destination Option must contain the correct nonce value for the packet to be accepted by the recipient and then passed to the ICMPv6 protocol for processing. If either of

Atkinson & Bhatti Expires in 6 months

[Page 6]

these requirements are not met, the received packet MUST be discarded as not authentic, and a security event SHOULD be logged by the system receiving the non-authentic packet.

Sessions operating in higher risk environments SHOULD use IP Security for ILNP [[ILNP-ENG](#)] [[RFC 4301](#)] *in addition* to the ILNPv6 Nonce Destination Option. Use of IP Security for ILNP to protect a packet does NOT permit the packet to be sent without the Nonce Destination Option.

Implementations need to support the case where a single ICMP Locator Update message contains a large number of Locator and Preference values and ought not develop a security fault (e.g. stack overflow) due to a received message containing more Locator values than expected.

[7. IANA Considerations](#)

IANA is requested to assign a value, replacing the XXX, to the ICMP Type listed in [Section 2](#), following the procedures in [RFC 4443].

There are no other IANA actions for this document.

[8. References](#)

[8.1. Normative References](#)

- [ILNP-ARCH] R. Atkinson and S. Bhatti, "ILNP Architecture", [draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-arch](#), January 2012.
- [ILNP-DNS] R. Atkinson and S. Bhatti, "DNS Resource Records for ILNP", [draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-dns](#), January 2012.
- [ILNP-ENG] R. Atkinson and S. Bhatti, "ILNP Engineering Considerations", [draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-eng](#), January 2012.
- [ILNP-Nonce] R. Atkinson and S. Bhatti, "Nonce Destination Option", [draft-irtf-rrg-ilnp-noncev6](#), January 2012.
- [RFC 2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC 2460] S. Deering & R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol Version 6 Specification", [RFC-2460](#), December 1998.

- [RFC 4301] S. Kent & K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", [RFC 4301](#), December 2005.
- [RFC 4443] A. Conta, S. Deering, and M. Gupta (Ed.), "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 4443](#), March 2006.

[8.2.](#) Informative References

tbd

[7.](#) ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Steve Blake, Mohamed Boucadair, Steve Hailes, Joel Halpern, Mark Handley, Volker Hilt, Tony Li, and Yakov Rehkter (in alphabetical order) provided review and feedback on earlier versions of the ILNP documents. Steve Blake provided an especially thorough review of the ILNP document set.

Author's Address

RJ Atkinson
Consultant
San Jose, CA
95125 USA

Email: rja.lists@gmail.com

S Bhatti
School of Computer Science
University of St Andrews
North Haugh, St Andrews,
Fife, Scotland, UK
KY 16 9SX

Email: saleem@cs.st-andrews.ac.uk

Expires: 09 JUL 2012

