Major Issues

- Fix DHCP discussion (see upcoming slide)
- Resolve security & IPsec discussion (see upcoming slide)
- MLD discussion (see upcoming slide)
- update ref to RFC 3776 to add RFC 4877 as well.
  - editorial fix
- RFC 5121: IPv6 over WiMAX support
  - Needs more discussion
- Support for RFC 5095
  - depreciation of Routing Header 0, can add in next update.
- Include RFC 5175
  - extensions to RA flags
- include in section 5.3.1 reference to MTU
  - any opinions
- update ref in title to 4213
  - editorial fix
MLD Text (fixed in current update)

- Thomas Narten suggested (roughly) the following text.

- Nodes that need to join multicast groups MUST support MLDv1 RFC3590. MLDv1 is needed by any node that is expected to receive and process multicast traffic. Note that Neighbor Discovery (as used on most link types -- see Section 5.2) depends on multicast and requires that nodes join Solicited Node multicast addresses.

- Nodes that need to join multicast groups SHOULD implement MLDv2. However, if the node has applications that only need support for Any-Source Multicast RFC3569, the node MAY implement MLDv1 RFC2710 instead. If the node has applications that need support for Source-Specific Multicast RFC3569, RFC4607, the node MUST support MLDv2 RFC3810. In all cases, nodes are strongly encouraged to implement MLDv2 rather than MLDv1, as the presence of a single MLDv1 participant on a link requires that all other nodes on the link operate in version 1 compatibility mode.

- When MLDv1 is used, the rules in the Source Address Selection for the Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Protocol RFC3590 MUST be followed.
Fix IPsec Discussion

• Many people have discussed the need to relax the current IPsec requirements in the Node Requirements. Currently, we have no mechanisms to change existing Standards Track document via this document.

• My proposal is to get a clear view on what the 6MAN working wants to do about the requirement levels for IPsec, and bring that to a discussion with the Security Area Directors.

• Currently, I don’t think we have consensus on the requirement levels.

• How should we progress on this?
  • a) Leave document as is
  • b) Make a new proposal, get WG consensus and move forward?
Fix DHCP Discussion

• From Thomas Narten:
  • One thing to add to the list is the discussion about DHCP. The current document is wrong, and it actually includes a new MUST (to invoke DHCP if there are no routers), yet the document is only informational -- I don't believe this document was ever supposed to set new requirements, so something needs to give.

  • There is also the larger issue of how to fix the M&O bits, but I think that is outside of the scope of this document. My recommendation is that the Node Requirements document should reflect existing documents, and should change or modifying existing standards