Updates on draft-ietf-manet-nhdp-sec

Ulrich Herberg
Thomas Clausen

Updates on draft-ietf-manet-nhdp-sec-02

- Editorial updates (update terminology to RFC6622)

- Decided *against* specifying address ICVs

  - Reason: Not possible to protect against *negative* advertisement of addresses (i.e., a router *not* advertising addresses of a neighbor, or with a zero link quality)

  - Only limited use cases

Discussion (comment by Chris Dearlove)

- Allow for adding ICVs to RFC5444 packets (in addition to HELLO messages)?

- Answer of the nhdp-sec authors:

  - We strongly support specifying that

  - But: we prefer in another document, because:

    - Other protocols that do not use NHDP may want to use packet ICVs as well

Next steps

- WG LC?