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Motivation

• Links with bad multicast performance
• Point-to-point unicast links
• Unicast security (DTLS, IPsec)
Problem

- Seqno and Interval are per interface
- Cannot send Hello to only one neighbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+-----------------------------------------------------------+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-----------------------------------------------------------+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-----------------------------------------------------------+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello TLV
Solution

- Reserved → Flags
- UNICAST Flag
- Seqno & Interface
  - per-interface
  - per-neighbour
Interoperability

- Multicast hellos are backwards compatible

- What is mandated?
  - Understand UNICAST flag

- What is not mandated?
  - No need to send both
Implementation changes

• Add seqno, interval, hello history, timer to Neighbor Table

• Changes to cost computation
Unscheduled Hellos

- Interval = 0, no promise of any following Hello
- Still increment seqno
- Should not be used for neighbor acquisition
- Allows implementation to only send scheduled periodic Hellos of one type but still send other type
Questions?