

# IPv6 Node Requirements

`draft-ietf-6man-node-req-bis-02.txt`

# 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 Listen Discovery (MLD) Protocol RFC3590 **MUST** be followed.

# Fix IPsec Discussion

- Many people have discussed the need to relax the current IPsec requirements 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