



**I E T F<sup>®</sup>**

# IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options Processing Procedures

**<draft-ietf-6man-hbh-processing-01>**

Bob Hinden  
Gorry Fairhurst

July 2022  
IETF114

# Changes from -00 draft



- Added text to Section 1 that the focus of this document is to set a **minimum bound** on the number of Hop-by-Hop Options a node should process.
- Added text to Section 4 that the authors expect some Hop-by-Hop options will be supported Internet wide, and others only in limited domains.
- # 7, Added reference to RFC 7872 in Section 4.
- #6, Revised text in Section 4 to reflect the constraints on publishing RFC 8200 to progress on standards track.
- Fixed typo in last paragraph of Section 5.2.
- #21, Changed text in Section 6 that new options **SHOULD NOT** (from MUST NOT) be defined that are not expected to be processed at full forwarding rates.

# Issue Tracker



- **Captured Issues** raised in Adoption Call  
<https://github.com/ietf-6man/hbh-processing/issues>

Currently 9 open issues

# Open Issues Summary



**#18 : What status will the recommendations/requirements have?**

- Expect WG to discuss this issue

**#9 #15 : Should we deprecate Router Alert?**

Are routers required to process (RAO)?

- Expect WG to discuss this issue in another draft

**#5 #12 : slow/fast path**

- we think resolved?

**#8 : Lack of graceful handling of malformed EHs?**

- Ready for offers of text

**#4 : RFC9098 notes that nodes do need to process payload**

- Expect WG to discuss this issue

**#3 : Does the WG have ASIC experience with EH?**

- May be relevant to a different draft, we expect to close this issue

**#2 : Leading edge line-speed routers might ignore HBH EH!**

- ?

# Issue #5, #12 - Definition of Fast Path and Slow Path?



- Current draft discusses **full forwarding rate**.

# Issue #8 - Lack of graceful handling of malformed EHs



- One of the main security problems associated with IPv6 EHs is that too many implementations seem fail to gracefully handle malformed/malicious Ehs.
- Is this different from other headers (IPv6, EH, Transport)?
- Editors: Please suggest text for the security considerations.

# Issue #4 - RFC9098 notes that nodes **do need to process payload**



- Misses the discussion in RFC9098: quite often forwarding nodes do need to process IPv6 payloads.
- Are HBH Options considered payloads?
- Editors: What text do we add about this?

# Next Steps

- Resolve issues.
- Receive more comments/issues ?
- Revise the ID.





# QUESTIONS / COMMENTS?

<https://github.com/ietf-6man/hbh-processing/issues>