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• Changes since Montréal:
  – The draft is updated with all recent comments since last IETF
  – Including comments from 6man WG,
  – From Erik
  – and from the HRPC (Human Rights Protocol Considerations, Amelia).
RFC 8280

• As part of efforts in the Human Rights Protocol Considerations (HRPC) group, Amelia has reviewed the human rights considerations (RFC 8280)
• Need to remove reference to RFC8280
• RFC8280 doesn't need to be listed as a reference, because it's an IRTF Research Group document.
• The review is meant to be helpful, not compulsory.
Comments from 6man

• The main ND changes were suggested by 6MAN and by Erik Nordmark.
• They were addressed in version 26 and 30.
• The respective changes are listed in the ChangeLog.
• Thy are:
  • -30: a clarification on the reliability of ND over OCB and over 802.11.
We added the following paragraph:

"The Neighbor Discovery protocol (ND) [RFC4861] is used over 802.11-OCB links. The reliability of the ND protocol over 802.11-OCB is the reliability of the delivery of ND multicast messages. This reliability is the same as the reliability of delivery of ND multicast messages over 802.11 links operated with a BSS ID."

[Link to RFC4861]
Comments from 6man

- 26: moved text from SLAAC section and from Design Considerations appendix about privacy into a new Privacy Considerations subsection of the Security section;

- Reformulated the SLAAC and IID sections to stress only LLs can use EUI-64;

- Removed the "GeoIP" wireshark explanation; reformulated SLAAC and LL sections;
Comments from 6man

• added brief mention of need of use LLs;
• clarified text about MAC address changes;
• dropped pseudonym discussion;
• changed title of section describing examples of packet formats.
Privacy protection of vehicles

- Comments from Dirk and Amelia, paragraph to be added:

“The demand for privacy protection of vehicles' and drivers' identities which could be granted by using a pseudonym or alias identity at the same time may hamper the required confidentiality of messages and trust between participants - especially in safety critical vehicular communication. *Particular challenges arise when the pseudonymization mechanism used relies on (randomized) re-addressing.* A proper pseudonymization tool operated by a trusted third party may be needed to ensure both aspects concurrently. *This is discussed in sect. 4.6 and 5.* Pseudonymity is also discussed in [I-D.ietf-ipwave-vehicular-networking] in sect. 4.2.4 and 5.1.2."