Admin
Three documents have been accepted as WG item: lla-only, opsecv6, ipv6-implications-on-ipv4-networks
What to do with the WG I-D? Should we move it to a WiKi? Ron Bonica: if there is no intend to move it RFC, then WiKi is a good way to keep the information.

Link-local only, Behringer & Vyncke
Version -02. Michael presents the ideas behind the I-D: using LLA addresses (and not broader scope) on infrastructure links. The I-D presents the pros and cons and does not recommend anything.
Changes: biggest change is IXP use case (adding reference to jdurand I-D), typos, clarifications. IXP use case for security: do not announce prefix (but then uRPF issues), use ACL (but then rely on ACL on each routers). LLA-only solves the security issues by forcing the use of ICMP sourced by loopback/interface from the SP addressing space.
Authors believe that the I-D is stable now except for the IXP section where review is requested. Asking to move to WGLC.
KK: who read the I-D? about 10 people read the draft including the IXP section.
Ron Bonica: would be nice to have someone from IXP operator to review

Open Security Consideration for IPv6 Networks, KK & others
-00 as it was moved as a WG item. Added 3GPP section thanks to Jouni, addressed multiple comments from the mailing list. -01 posted on Nov 8 with a complete draft. The I-D was presented by Merike at RIPE meeting in Amsterdam in October to get confirmation: nobody uses SeND, RTBH & uRPF are used indeed.
KK asks the room about different questions during the WG meeting but little answers.
Tim Chown: no SeND implementation hence no use, layer-2 can be problematic when the limit of IP address/MAC is badly configured
Paul Matthews: syslog and SNMP are often use for logging
Joel Jaggli: ND/RA rate limiting is well known in other areas, in same deployments he tunes the timer (such on NUD) to avoid losing information about neighbors too early, but, this requires knows in the nodes. KK we reference RFC 6558.
Warren: there is a specific I-D about this topic
Next steps: need more operational input from operators (NANOG), should be close to WGLC
Humm test shows that the WG agrees to move to WGLC

BGP Operations and security, Durand & others
Presented remotely by Jérôme Durand.
This is version -02. The I-D includes control plane protection and BGP sessions protection. It covers prefix filters with a specific case for IXP prefix which is usually too long and is often dropped by other SP => ICMP messages sourced from IXP prefix are then dropped by uRPF later. Beside prefix filtering the I-D includes route flap dampening, AS-path filters, BGP next-hop filters.
Changes in -02: all prefixes were replaced by pointers to registries, TCP-AO is included, new control plane protection section, new next-hop filtering section, ...
Great feedbacks received until now, more would be welcome. Is it time to be adopted as WG item?
David Lapner: BGP MD5 and TCP-AO are last resort solution when compared to TTL security which is probably the wrong order.

Paul Matthews: some routers do not support TTL security, hence MD5 & TCP-AO are last resort and useful. Which is the audience? Probably operators but could also be for enterprises using BGP.
KK: how many people read the draft? 4, 10 people believes that this should be adopted as WG item. There is consensus to adopt it as WG item.
Paul Hoffman: the I-D should discuss more the TTL security, MD5, TCP-AO; Ron: this detailed discussion should perhaps be moved into another I-D.

Network Reconnaissance in IPv6 Networks, Gont, Chown
Scanning is also used for defensive purposes and not only for finding targets. I-D describes techniques to be able to scan, the intent is to obsolete and replace RFC 5157. This version adds more reconnaissance techniques. Can we adopt this as a WG item?
KK: how many people have read the draft: 5, working group item: 3
Tim Chown as co-author RFC 5157: I agree to obsolete the previous RFC and would like to move to a WG item

DHCPv6-Shield: Protecting Against Rogue DHCPv6 Servers, Gont, Liu
It is the IPv6 version of IPv4 DHCP-snooping and complements RA-guard. Wants to go to WGLC. Fernando wants to have other vendors joining.
Gunter Vandevelde: should align with SAVI WG for the DHCP learning document.
Tim Chown: this technique is efficient and lighter than SAVI
Jean-Michel Combes as SAVI WG chair: this I-D is different and this I-D should be adopted
KK: this I-D should refer to SAVI documents
Paul Matthews: issue when the switch does not have enough resource to parse the full extension header chain then the packet SHOULD NOT pass the packet. Warren: should be able to have a knob for this.
A lot of discussions about having another I-D about parsing extension header and issues with length.

Virtual Private Network (VPN) traffic leakages in dual-stack hosts/networks, Gont
It is about the known issue of 'no-split tunneling' policy which applies only to IPv4 traffic and not IPv6 traffic (implementation issue of old VPN). Asking to be a WG item.
Counting: 5 people reading the draft, 7 people OK for WG item, 1 does not want
Paul Matthews: which is the intended purpose? Fernando: raise awareness
Tim Chown: mixed feeling about the document
Paul Hoffman and others (note taker was in the queue) have varying opinions to whether having a RFC is useful compared to a CVE vulnerability.

Passive IP addresses, Baker, Vande Velde
Asking for more reactions as there have been few until now. This I-D could solve some problems identified in LLA-ONLY I-D. The version -01 only adds reference to lla-only I-D + clarification. Passive addresses are normal addresses that can be used as source address but cannot receive packets (packets are dropped when received).
Ron Bonica: ICMP extensions can also be used in a lla-only case
Warren Kumari: how is it different to iACL? Gunter: passive addresses also protects from attack from within the network
Jean-Michel Combes: do you want to re-invent personal firewall? Gunter: easier to configure, Eric Vyncke: also less error-prone
Paul Mathews: 'passive' is probably a wrong word because it is confusing
Brian Wilson: missing the other halve? agrees with Warren's comment

KK: it seems that more discussion are needed before becoming a WG item.