

Assisted tunnel set up requirement

Draft-ietf-v6ops-assisted-tuneling-00.txt

Issues from last call

Prefix length for tunnel link

- ? Today: "Assignment of an IPv6 address (/128) to the end-node must be supported in both modes. "
- ? Jeroen: /64 should be used on link
- ? Proposed resolution:
 - Keep /128 for interoperability
 - Refer to RFC3177 for address delegation recommendations

Tunnel endpoint discovery

- ? Jeroen, Jordi: reference draft-palet-v6ops-tun-auto-disc
- ? Proposed resolution: accept.

Load balancing (“brokering”)

- ? Pekka: Add section on non requirement for load balancing.

- ? Proposed resolution:
 - Add section to discuss load balancing/brokering issues
 - Add a requirement for a load balancing solution without specifying how.

Securing the setup session

- ? Jeroen: Protect the setup session to make sure no information is disclosed
- ? Proposed resolution: Registered mode must protect authentication. Registered and non-registered mode may protect the entire session (optional).

Securing the tunnel link

- ? Jeroen: If we secure the set-up, the next attack is on the tunnel itself, we have to secure it.
- ? Proposed resolution:
Do nothing, this may not be required in all scenarios. An implementation may offer secure tunnel (optional).
- ? Pekka: Add an explicit (non) requirement that all the packets need not be signed/verified.
- ? Proposed resolution: will add.

The R word

- ? Brian Carpenter: Change “requirements” to “goals” and “MUST” to “must”.

- ? Proposed resolution:
 - MUST to must: ok
 - Requirement to Goals: ?
(this depends on what please the IESG of the day)

Acknowledgments

- ? Pekka: keep in sync
- ? Proposed resolution: will do.