

# ICMPv6 Update

## draft-ietf-ipngwg-icmp-v3-04.txt

IETF60 San Diego

Aug 2004

Mukesh Gupta, Nokia

# Background

- RFC2463 was published as Draft Standard in December 1998
- WG submitted an update to IESG to recycle Draft Standard
  - draft-ietf-ipngwg-icmp-v3-02.txt
- Version 03 & 04 attempted to address ADs comments
- The WG Last Call on version 04 ended on May 18<sup>th</sup> 2004.

# The Comments

- Remove an unimplemented ICMP source address selection specification i.e. section 2.2 (c)

Action:

- The chairs don't see enough consensus to remove the section. So it will NOT be removed.

- Replace the text

“As much of invoking packet as **will fit** without ICMPv6 packet exceeding the minimum IPv6 MTU” with

“As much of invoking packet as **possible** without ICMPv6 packet exceeding the minimum IPv6 MTU”

Action:

- will be updated in the next version. Any objection ?

# The Comments (contd.)

- ICMP type value assignment should require “IESG Approval” instead of the approach proposed in the draft.

## Arguments:

- Disagree that this is necessary. The current text requires WG and AD approval for IETF WG early assignments. This will keep assignments under control.
- Agree that the text should be changed to increase the difficulty if an outside request want more than a single type value.

## Action:

- The text needs to be updated. Proposed text on the next page.

# Proposed Text

- Current: (in section 6.1)
  3. Requests for type value assignments from outside of the IETF should be sent to the IETF for review. The general guideline for this review is that the assignment should be made if there is public and open documentation of the protocol and if the assignment is not being used to circumvent an existing IETF protocol or work in progress.
- Proposed.
  3. Requests for single type value assignments from outside of the IETF should be sent to the IETF for review. The general guideline for this review is that the assignment should be made if there is public and open documentation of the protocol and if the assignment is not being used to circumvent an existing IETF protocol or work in progress. Requests for assignments for multiple type value assignments require IESG approval.

# The Comments (contd.)

- Assignment policy for code values for existing types defined in the draft is missing

Action: The text needs to be updated.

# Proposed Text

- Current: (end of section 6.1)

The policy for assigning Code values for new IPv6 ICMP Types should be defined in the document defining the new Type values.

- Proposed:

The assignment of new Code values for the Type values defined in this document require standards action or IESG approval. The policy for assigning Code values for new IPv6 ICMP Types not defined in this document should be defined in the document defining the new Type values.

# What Next..

- The updated draft will be submitted soon after IETF.
- Do we need another WG Last Call ?



# Coments/Questions ?