

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 6434
Obsoletes: [4294](#)
Category: Informational
ISSN: 2070-1721

E. Jankiewicz
SRI International, Inc.
J. Loughney
Nokia
T. Narten
IBM Corporation
December 2011

IPv6 Node Requirements

Abstract

This document defines requirements for IPv6 nodes. It is expected that IPv6 will be deployed in a wide range of devices and situations. Specifying the requirements for IPv6 nodes allows IPv6 to function well and interoperate in a large number of situations and deployments.

This document obsoletes [RFC 4294](#).

Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for informational purposes.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see [Section 2 of RFC 5741](#).

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6434>.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must

include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1. Scope of This Document	5
1.2. Description of IPv6 Nodes	5
2. Requirements Language	5
3. Abbreviations Used in This Document	5
4. Sub-IP Layer	6
5. IP Layer	7
5.1. Internet Protocol Version 6 - RFC 2460	7
5.2. Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - RFC 4861	8
5.3. Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes - RFC 4191	9
5.4. SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SEND) - RFC 3971	9
5.5. IPv6 Router Advertisement Flags Option - RFC 5175	9
5.6. Path MTU Discovery and Packet Size	10
5.6.1. Path MTU Discovery - RFC 1981	10
5.7. IPv6 Jumbograms - RFC 2675	10
5.8. ICMP for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) - RFC 4443	10
5.9. Addressing	11
5.9.1. IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture - RFC 4291	11
5.9.2. IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration - RFC 4862	11
5.9.3. Privacy Extensions for Address Configuration in IPv6 - RFC 4941	12
5.9.4. Default Address Selection for IPv6 - RFC 3484	12
5.9.5. Stateful Address Autoconfiguration (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315	12
5.10. Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6	13
6. DHCP versus Router Advertisement Options for Host Configuration	13
7. DNS and DHCP	14

7.1.	DNS	14
7.2.	Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315	15
7.2.1.	Other Configuration Information	15
7.2.2.	Use of Router Advertisements in Managed Environments	15
7.3.	IPv6 Router Advertisement Options for DNS Configuration - RFC 6106	15
8.	IPv4 Support and Transition	16
8.1.	Transition Mechanisms	16
8.1.1.	Basic Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers - RFC 4213	16
9.	Application Support	16
9.1.	Textual Representation of IPv6 Addresses - RFC 5952	16
9.2.	Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)	16
10.	Mobility	17
11.	Security	17
11.1.	Requirements	18
11.2.	Transforms and Algorithms	19
12.	Router-Specific Functionality	19
12.1.	IPv6 Router Alert Option - RFC 2711	19
12.2.	Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - RFC 4861	19
12.3.	Stateful Address Autoconfiguration (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315	19
13.	Network Management	20
13.1.	Management Information Base (MIB) Modules	20
13.1.1.	IP Forwarding Table MIB	20
13.1.2.	Management Information Base for the Internet Protocol (IP)	20
14.	Security Considerations	20
15.	Authors and Acknowledgments	21
15.1.	Authors and Acknowledgments (Current Document)	21
15.2.	Authors and Acknowledgments from RFC 4279	21
16.	Appendix: Changes from RFC 4294	22
17.	References	23
17.1.	Normative References	23
17.2.	Informative References	26

1. Introduction

This document defines common functionality required from both IPv6 hosts and routers. Many IPv6 nodes will implement optional or additional features, but this document collects and summarizes requirements from other published Standards Track documents in one place.

This document tries to avoid discussion of protocol details and references RFCs for this purpose. This document is intended to be an applicability statement and to provide guidance as to which IPv6 specifications should be implemented in the general case and which specifications may be of interest to specific deployment scenarios. This document does not update any individual protocol document RFCs.

Although this document points to different specifications, it should be noted that in many cases, the granularity of a particular requirement will be smaller than a single specification, as many specifications define multiple, independent pieces, some of which may not be mandatory. In addition, most specifications define both client and server behavior in the same specification, while many implementations will be focused on only one of those roles.

This document defines a minimal level of requirement needed for a device to provide useful internet service and considers a broad range of device types and deployment scenarios. Because of the wide range of deployment scenarios, the minimal requirements specified in this document may not be sufficient for all deployment scenarios. It is perfectly reasonable (and indeed expected) for other profiles to define additional or stricter requirements appropriate for specific usage and deployment environments. For example, this document does not mandate that all clients support DHCP, but some deployment scenarios may deem it appropriate to make such a requirement. For example, government agencies in the USA have defined profiles for specialized requirements for IPv6 in target environments (see [DODv6] and [USGv6]).

As it is not always possible for an implementer to know the exact usage of IPv6 in a node, an overriding requirement for IPv6 nodes is that they should adhere to Jon Postel's Robustness Principle: "Be conservative in what you do, be liberal in what you accept from others" [RFC0793].

1.1. Scope of This Document

IPv6 covers many specifications. It is intended that IPv6 will be deployed in many different situations and environments. Therefore, it is important to develop requirements for IPv6 nodes to ensure interoperability.

This document assumes that all IPv6 nodes meet the minimum requirements specified here.

1.2. Description of IPv6 Nodes

From the Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification [[RFC2460](#)], we have the following definitions:

IPv6 node - a device that implements IPv6.

IPv6 router - a node that forwards IPv6 packets not explicitly addressed to itself.

IPv6 host - any node that is not a router.

2. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

3. Abbreviations Used in This Document

ATM	Asynchronous Transfer Mode
AH	Authentication Header
DAD	Duplicate Address Detection
ESP	Encapsulating Security Payload
ICMP	Internet Control Message Protocol
IKE	Internet Key Exchange
MIB	Management Information Base
MLD	Multicast Listener Discovery
MTU	Maximum Transmission Unit

NA Neighbor Advertisement

NBMA Non-Broadcast Multiple Access

ND Neighbor Discovery

NS Neighbor Solicitation

NUD Neighbor Unreachability Detection

PPP Point-to-Point Protocol

4. Sub-IP Layer

An IPv6 node must include support for one or more IPv6 link-layer specifications. Which link-layer specifications an implementation should include will depend upon what link-layers are supported by the hardware available on the system. It is possible for a conformant IPv6 node to support IPv6 on some of its interfaces and not on others.

As IPv6 is run over new layer 2 technologies, it is expected that new specifications will be issued. In the following, we list some of the layer 2 technologies for which an IPv6 specification has been developed. It is provided for informational purposes only and may not be complete.

- Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks [[RFC2464](#)]
- IPv6 over ATM Networks [[RFC2492](#)]
- Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Frame Relay Networks Specification [[RFC2590](#)]
- Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 1394 Networks [[RFC3146](#)]
- Transmission of IPv6, IPv4, and Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) Packets over Fibre Channel [[RFC4338](#)]
- Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks [[RFC4944](#)]
- Transmission of IPv6 via the IPv6 Convergence Sublayer over IEEE 802.16 Networks [[RFC5121](#)]
- IP version 6 over PPP [[RFC5072](#)]

In addition to traditional physical link-layers, it is also possible to tunnel IPv6 over other protocols. Examples include:

- Teredo: Tunneling IPv6 over UDP through Network Address Translations (NATs) [[RFC4380](#)]
- [Section 3](#) of "Basic Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers" [[RFC4213](#)]

5. IP Layer

5.1. Internet Protocol Version 6 - [RFC 2460](#)

The Internet Protocol Version 6 is specified in [[RFC2460](#)]. This specification MUST be supported.

Any unrecognized extension headers or options MUST be processed as described in [RFC 2460](#).

The node MUST follow the packet transmission rules in [RFC 2460](#).

Nodes MUST always be able to send, receive, and process fragment headers. All conformant IPv6 implementations MUST be capable of sending and receiving IPv6 packets; the forwarding functionality MAY be supported. Overlapping fragments MUST be handled as described in [[RFC5722](#)].

[RFC 2460](#) specifies extension headers and the processing for these headers.

An IPv6 node MUST be able to process these headers. An exception is Routing Header type 0 (RH0), which was deprecated by [[RFC5095](#)] due to security concerns and which MUST be treated as an unrecognized routing type.

All nodes SHOULD support the setting and use of the IPv6 Flow Label field as defined in the IPv6 Flow Label specification [[RFC6437](#)]. Forwarding nodes such as routers and load distributors MUST NOT depend only on Flow Label values being uniformly distributed. It is RECOMMENDED that source hosts support the flow label by setting the Flow Label field for all packets of a given flow to the same value chosen from an approximation to a discrete uniform distribution.

5.2. Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - RFC 4861

Neighbor Discovery is defined in [RFC4861]; the definition was updated by [RFC5942]. Neighbor Discovery SHOULD be supported. RFC 4861 states:

Unless specified otherwise (in a document that covers operating IP over a particular link type) this document applies to all link types. However, because ND uses link-layer multicast for some of its services, it is possible that on some link types (e.g., Non-Broadcast Multi-Access (NBMA) links), alternative protocols or mechanisms to implement those services will be specified (in the appropriate document covering the operation of IP over a particular link type). The services described in this document that are not directly dependent on multicast, such as Redirects, next-hop determination, Neighbor Unreachability Detection, etc., are expected to be provided as specified in this document. The details of how one uses ND on NBMA links are addressed in [RFC2491].

Some detailed analysis of Neighbor Discovery follows:

Router Discovery is how hosts locate routers that reside on an attached link. Hosts MUST support Router Discovery functionality.

Prefix Discovery is how hosts discover the set of address prefixes that define which destinations are on-link for an attached link. Hosts MUST support Prefix Discovery.

Hosts MUST also implement Neighbor Unreachability Detection (NUD) for all paths between hosts and neighboring nodes. NUD is not required for paths between routers. However, all nodes MUST respond to unicast Neighbor Solicitation (NS) messages.

Hosts MUST support the sending of Router Solicitations and the receiving of Router Advertisements. The ability to understand individual Router Advertisement options is dependent on supporting the functionality making use of the particular option.

All nodes MUST support the sending and receiving of Neighbor Solicitation (NS) and Neighbor Advertisement (NA) messages. NS and NA messages are required for Duplicate Address Detection (DAD).

Hosts SHOULD support the processing of Redirect functionality. Routers MUST support the sending of Redirects, though not necessarily for every individual packet (e.g., due to rate limiting). Redirects are only useful on networks supporting hosts. In core networks dominated by routers, Redirects are typically disabled. The sending

of Redirects SHOULD be disabled by default on backbone routers. They MAY be enabled by default on routers intended to support hosts on edge networks.

"IPv6 Host-to-Router Load Sharing" [RFC4311] includes additional recommendations on how to select from a set of available routers. [RFC4311] SHOULD be supported.

5.3. Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes - RFC 4191

"Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes" [RFC4191] provides support for nodes attached to multiple (different) networks, each providing routers that advertise themselves as default routers via Router Advertisements. In some scenarios, one router may provide connectivity to destinations the other router does not, and choosing the "wrong" default router can result in reachability failures. In such cases, RFC 4191 can help.

Small Office/Home Office (SOHO) deployments supported by routers adhering to [RFC6204] use RFC 4191 to advertise routes to certain local destinations. Consequently, nodes that will be deployed in SOHO environments SHOULD implement RFC 4191.

5.4. SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SEND) - RFC 3971

SEND [RFC3971] and Cryptographically Generated Address (CGA) [RFC3972] provide a way to secure the message exchanges of Neighbor Discovery. SEND is a new technology in that it has no IPv4 counterpart, but it has significant potential to address certain classes of spoofing attacks. While there have been some implementations of SEND, there has been only limited deployment experience to date in using the technology. In addition, the IETF working group CgA & Send maIntenance (csi) is currently working on additional extensions intended to make SEND more attractive for deployment.

At this time, SEND is considered optional, and IPv6 nodes MAY provide SEND functionality.

5.5. IPv6 Router Advertisement Flags Option - RFC 5175

Router Advertisements include an 8-bit field of single-bit Router Advertisement flags. The Router Advertisement Flags Option extends the number of available flag bits by 48 bits. At the time of this writing, 6 of the original 8 single-bit flags have been assigned, while 2 remain available for future assignment. No flags have been defined that make use of the new option, and thus, strictly speaking, there is no requirement to implement the option today. However,

implementations that are able to pass unrecognized options to a higher-level entity that may be able to understand them (e.g., a user-level process using a "raw socket" facility) MAY take steps to handle the option in anticipation of a future usage.

5.6. Path MTU Discovery and Packet Size

5.6.1. Path MTU Discovery - RFC 1981

"Path MTU Discovery for IP version 6" [RFC1981] SHOULD be supported. From [RFC2460]:

It is strongly recommended that IPv6 nodes implement Path MTU Discovery [RFC1981], in order to discover and take advantage of path MTUs greater than 1280 octets. However, a minimal IPv6 implementation (e.g., in a boot ROM) may simply restrict itself to sending packets no larger than 1280 octets, and omit implementation of Path MTU Discovery.

The rules in [RFC2460] and [RFC5722] MUST be followed for packet fragmentation and reassembly.

One operational issue with Path MTU Discovery occurs when firewalls block ICMP Packet Too Big messages. Path MTU Discovery relies on such messages to determine what size messages can be successfully sent. "Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery" [RFC4821] avoids having a dependency on Packet Too Big messages.

5.7. IPv6 Jumbograms - RFC 2675

IPv6 Jumbograms [RFC2675] are an optional extension that allow the sending of IP datagrams larger than 65,535 bytes. IPv6 Jumbograms make use of IPv6 hop-by-hop options and are only suitable on paths in which every hop and link are capable of supporting Jumbograms (e.g., within a campus or datacenter). To date, few implementations exist, and there is essentially no reported experience from usage.

Consequently, IPv6 Jumbograms [RFC2675] remain optional at this time.

5.8. ICMP for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) - RFC 4443

ICMPv6 [RFC4443] MUST be supported. "Extended ICMP to Support Multi-Part Messages" [RFC4884] MAY be supported.

5.9. Addressing

5.9.1. IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture - RFC 4291

The IPv6 Addressing Architecture [RFC4291] MUST be supported.

5.9.2. IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration - RFC 4862

Hosts MUST support IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration as defined in [RFC4862]. Configuration of static address(es) may be supported as well.

Nodes that are routers MUST be able to generate link-local addresses as described in [RFC4862].

From RFC 4862:

The autoconfiguration process specified in this document applies only to hosts and not routers. Since host autoconfiguration uses information advertised by routers, routers will need to be configured by some other means. However, it is expected that routers will generate link-local addresses using the mechanism described in this document. In addition, routers are expected to successfully pass the Duplicate Address Detection procedure described in this document on all addresses prior to assigning them to an interface.

All nodes MUST implement Duplicate Address Detection. Quoting from Section 5.4 of RFC 4862:

Duplicate Address Detection MUST be performed on all unicast addresses prior to assigning them to an interface, regardless of whether they are obtained through stateless autoconfiguration, DHCPv6, or manual configuration, with the following [exceptions noted therein].

"Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) for IPv6" [RFC4429] specifies a mechanism to reduce delays associated with generating addresses via Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [RFC4862]. RFC 4429 was developed in conjunction with Mobile IPv6 in order to reduce the time needed to acquire and configure addresses as devices quickly move from one network to another, and it is desirable to minimize transition delays. For general purpose devices, RFC 4429 remains optional at this time.

5.9.3. Privacy Extensions for Address Configuration in IPv6 - RFC 4941

Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [RFC4941] addresses a specific problem involving a client device whose user is concerned about its activity or location being tracked. The problem arises both for a static client and for one that regularly changes its point of attachment to the Internet. When using Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [RFC4862], the Interface Identifier portion of formed addresses stays constant and is globally unique. Thus, although a node's global IPv6 address will change if it changes its point of attachment, the Interface Identifier portion of those addresses remains the same, making it possible for servers to track the location of an individual device as it moves around or its pattern of activity if it remains in one place. This may raise privacy concerns as described in [RFC4862].

In such situations, RFC 4941 SHOULD be implemented. In other cases, such as with dedicated servers in a data center, RFC 4941 provides limited or no benefit.

Implementers of RFC 4941 should be aware that certain addresses are reserved and should not be chosen for use as temporary addresses. Consult "Reserved IPv6 Interface Identifiers" [RFC5453] for more details.

5.9.4. Default Address Selection for IPv6 - RFC 3484

The rules specified in the Default Address Selection for IPv6 [RFC3484] document MUST be implemented. IPv6 nodes will need to deal with multiple addresses configured simultaneously.

5.9.5. Stateful Address Autoconfiguration (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315

DHCPv6 [RFC3315] can be used to obtain and configure addresses. In general, a network may provide for the configuration of addresses through Router Advertisements, DHCPv6, or both. There will be a wide range of IPv6 deployment models and differences in address assignment requirements, some of which may require DHCPv6 for address assignment. Consequently, all hosts SHOULD implement address configuration via DHCPv6.

In the absence of a router, IPv6 nodes using DHCP for address assignment MAY initiate DHCP to obtain IPv6 addresses and other configuration information, as described in Section 5.5.2 of [RFC4862].

5.10. Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6

Nodes that need to join multicast groups MUST support MLDv1 [RFC2710]. MLDv1 is needed by any node that is expected to receive and process multicast traffic. Note that Neighbor Discovery (as used on most link types -- see [Section 5.2](#)) depends on multicast and requires that nodes join Solicited Node multicast addresses.

MLDv2 [RFC3810] extends the functionality of MLDv1 by supporting Source-Specific Multicast. The original MLDv2 protocol [RFC3810] supporting Source-Specific Multicast [RFC4607] supports two types of "filter modes". Using an INCLUDE filter, a node indicates a multicast group along with a list of senders for the group from which it wishes to receive traffic. Using an EXCLUDE filter, a node indicates a multicast group along with a list of senders from which it wishes to exclude receiving traffic. In practice, operations to block source(s) using EXCLUDE mode are rarely used but add considerable implementation complexity to MLDv2. Lightweight MLDv2 [RFC5790] is a simplified subset of the original MLDv2 specification that omits EXCLUDE filter mode to specify undesired source(s).

Nodes SHOULD implement either MLDv2 [RFC3810] or Lightweight MLDv2 [RFC5790]. Specifically, nodes supporting applications using Source-Specific Multicast that expect to take advantage of MLDv2's EXCLUDE functionality [RFC3810] MUST support MLDv2 as defined in [RFC3810], [RFC4604], and [RFC4607]. Nodes supporting applications that expect to only take advantage of MLDv2's INCLUDE functionality as well as Any-Source Multicast will find it sufficient to support MLDv2 as defined in [RFC5790].

If a node only supports applications that use Any-Source Multicast (i.e., they do not use Source-Specific Multicast), implementing MLDv1 [RFC2710] is sufficient. In all cases, however, nodes are strongly encouraged to implement MLDv2 or Lightweight MLDv2 rather than MLDv1, as the presence of a single MLDv1 participant on a link requires that all other nodes on the link operate in version 1 compatibility mode.

When MLDv1 is used, the rules in the Source Address Selection for the Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Protocol [RFC3590] MUST be followed.

6. DHCP versus Router Advertisement Options for Host Configuration

In IPv6, there are two main protocol mechanisms for propagating configuration information to hosts: Router Advertisements (RAs) and DHCP. Historically, RA options have been restricted to those deemed essential for basic network functioning and for which all nodes are configured with exactly the same information. Examples include the

Prefix Information Options, the MTU option, etc. On the other hand, DHCP has generally been preferred for configuration of more general parameters and for parameters that may be client-specific. That said, identifying the exact line on whether a particular option should be configured via DHCP versus an RA option has not always been easy. Generally speaking, however, there has been a desire to define only one mechanism for configuring a given option, rather than defining multiple (different) ways of configuring the same information.

One issue with having multiple ways of configuring the same information is that interoperability suffers if a host chooses one mechanism but the network operator chooses a different mechanism. For "closed" environments, where the network operator has significant influence over what devices connect to the network and thus what configuration mechanisms they support, the operator may be able to ensure that a particular mechanism is supported by all connected hosts. In more open environments, however, where arbitrary devices may connect (e.g., a WIFI hotspot), problems can arise. To maximize interoperability in such environments, hosts would need to implement multiple configuration mechanisms to ensure interoperability.

Originally, in IPv6, configuring information about DNS servers was performed exclusively via DHCP. In 2007, an RA option was defined but was published as Experimental [RFC5006]. In 2010, "IPv6 Router Advertisement Options for DNS Configuration" [RFC6106] was published as a Standards Track document. Consequently, DNS configuration information can now be learned either through DHCP or through RAs. Hosts will need to decide which mechanism (or whether both) should be implemented. Specific guidance regarding DNS server discovery is discussed in [Section 7](#).

7. DNS and DHCP

7.1. DNS

DNS is described in [RFC1034], [RFC1035], [RFC3363], and [RFC3596]. Not all nodes will need to resolve names; those that will never need to resolve DNS names do not need to implement resolver functionality. However, the ability to resolve names is a basic infrastructure capability on which applications rely, and most nodes will need to provide support. All nodes SHOULD implement stub-resolver [RFC1034] functionality, as in [RFC1034], [Section 5.3.1](#), with support for:

- AAAA type Resource Records [RFC3596];
- reverse addressing in ip6.arpa using PTR records [RFC3596];

- Extension Mechanisms for DNS (EDNS0) [RFC2671] to allow for DNS packet sizes larger than 512 octets.

Those nodes are RECOMMENDED to support DNS security extensions [RFC4033] [RFC4034] [RFC4035].

Those nodes are NOT RECOMMENDED to support the experimental A6 Resource Records [RFC3363].

7.2. Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315

7.2.1. Other Configuration Information

IPv6 nodes use DHCP [RFC3315] to obtain address configuration information (see Section 5.9.5) and to obtain additional (non-address) configuration. If a host implementation supports applications or other protocols that require configuration that is only available via DHCP, hosts SHOULD implement DHCP. For specialized devices on which no such configuration need is present, DHCP may not be necessary.

An IPv6 node can use the subset of DHCP (described in [RFC3736]) to obtain other configuration information.

7.2.2. Use of Router Advertisements in Managed Environments

Nodes using the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6) are expected to determine their default router information and on-link prefix information from received Router Advertisements.

7.3. IPv6 Router Advertisement Options for DNS Configuration - RFC 6106

Router Advertisements have historically limited options to those that are critical to basic IPv6 functioning. Originally, DNS configuration was not included as an RA option, and DHCP was the recommended way to obtain DNS configuration information. Over time, the thinking surrounding such an option has evolved. It is now generally recognized that few nodes can function adequately without having access to a working DNS resolver. [RFC5006] was published as an Experimental document in 2007, and recently, a revised version was placed on the Standards Track [RFC6106].

Implementations SHOULD implement the DNS RA option [RFC6106].

8. IPv4 Support and Transition

IPv6 nodes MAY support IPv4.

8.1. Transition Mechanisms

8.1.1. Basic Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers - [RFC 4213](#)

If an IPv6 node implements dual stack and tunneling, then [[RFC4213](#)] MUST be supported.

9. Application Support

9.1. Textual Representation of IPv6 Addresses - [RFC 5952](#)

Software that allows users and operators to input IPv6 addresses in text form SHOULD support "A Recommendation for IPv6 Address Text Representation" [[RFC5952](#)].

9.2. Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)

There are a number of IPv6-related APIs. This document does not mandate the use of any, because the choice of API does not directly relate to on-the-wire behavior of protocols. Implementers, however, would be advised to consider providing a common API or reviewing existing APIs for the type of functionality they provide to applications.

"Basic Socket Interface Extensions for IPv6" [[RFC3493](#)] provides IPv6 functionality used by typical applications. Implementers should note that [RFC3493](#) has been picked up and further standardized by the Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX) [[POSIX](#)].

"Advanced Sockets Application Program Interface (API) for IPv6" [[RFC3542](#)] provides access to advanced IPv6 features needed by diagnostic and other more specialized applications.

"IPv6 Socket API for Source Address Selection" [[RFC5014](#)] provides facilities that allow an application to override the default Source Address Selection rules of [[RFC3484](#)].

"Socket Interface Extensions for Multicast Source Filters" [[RFC3678](#)] provides support for expressing source filters on multicast group memberships.

"Extension to Sockets API for Mobile IPv6" [RFC4584] provides application support for accessing and enabling Mobile IPv6 [RFC6275] features.

10. Mobility

Mobile IPv6 [RFC6275] and associated specifications [RFC3776] [RFC4877] allow a node to change its point of attachment within the Internet, while maintaining (and using) a permanent address. All communication using the permanent address continues to proceed as expected even as the node moves around. The definition of Mobile IP includes requirements for the following types of nodes:

- mobile nodes
- correspondent nodes with support for route optimization
- home agents
- all IPv6 routers

At the present time, Mobile IP has seen only limited implementation and no significant deployment, partly because it originally assumed an IPv6-only environment rather than a mixed IPv4/IPv6 Internet. Recently, additional work has been done to support mobility in mixed-mode IPv4 and IPv6 networks [RFC5555].

More usage and deployment experience is needed with mobility before any specific approach can be recommended for broad implementation in all hosts and routers. Consequently, [RFC6275], [RFC5555], and associated standards such as [RFC4877] are considered a MAY at this time.

11. Security

This section describes the specification for security for IPv6 nodes.

Achieving security in practice is a complex undertaking. Operational procedures, protocols, key distribution mechanisms, certificate management approaches, etc., are all components that impact the level of security actually achieved in practice. More importantly, deficiencies or a poor fit in any one individual component can significantly reduce the overall effectiveness of a particular security approach.

IPsec provides channel security at the Internet layer, making it possible to provide secure communication for all (or a subset of) communication flows at the IP layer between pairs of internet nodes. IPsec provides sufficient flexibility and granularity that individual TCP connections can (selectively) be protected, etc.

Although IPsec can be used with manual keying in some cases, such usage has limited applicability and is not recommended.

A range of security technologies and approaches proliferate today (e.g., IPsec, Transport Layer Security (TLS), Secure SHell (SSH), etc.) No one approach has emerged as an ideal technology for all needs and environments. Moreover, IPsec is not viewed as the ideal security technology in all cases and is unlikely to displace the others.

Previously, IPv6 mandated implementation of IPsec and recommended the key management approach of IKE. This document updates that recommendation by making support of the IPsec Architecture [RFC4301] a SHOULD for all IPv6 nodes. Note that the IPsec Architecture requires (e.g., Section 4.5 of RFC 4301) the implementation of both manual and automatic key management. Currently, the default automated key management protocol to implement is IKEv2 [RFC5996].

This document recognizes that there exists a range of device types and environments where approaches to security other than IPsec can be justified. For example, special-purpose devices may support only a very limited number or type of applications, and an application-specific security approach may be sufficient for limited management or configuration capabilities. Alternatively, some devices may run on extremely constrained hardware (e.g., sensors) where the full IPsec Architecture is not justified.

11.1. Requirements

"Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" [RFC4301] SHOULD be supported by all IPv6 nodes. Note that the IPsec Architecture requires (e.g., Section 4.5 of [RFC4301]) the implementation of both manual and automatic key management. Currently, the default automated key management protocol to implement is IKEv2. As required in [RFC4301], IPv6 nodes implementing the IPsec Architecture MUST implement ESP [RFC4303] and MAY implement AH [RFC4302].

11.2. Transforms and Algorithms

The current set of mandatory-to-implement algorithms for the IPsec Architecture are defined in "Cryptographic Algorithm Implementation Requirements For ESP and AH" [RFC4835]. IPv6 nodes implementing the IPsec Architecture MUST conform to the requirements in [RFC4835]. Preferred cryptographic algorithms often change more frequently than security protocols. Therefore, implementations MUST allow for migration to new algorithms, as RFC 4835 is replaced or updated in the future.

The current set of mandatory-to-implement algorithms for IKEv2 are defined in "Cryptographic Algorithms for Use in the Internet Key Exchange Version 2 (IKEv2)" [RFC4307]. IPv6 nodes implementing IKEv2 MUST conform to the requirements in [RFC4307] and/or any future updates or replacements to [RFC4307].

12. Router-Specific Functionality

This section defines general host considerations for IPv6 nodes that act as routers. Currently, this section does not discuss routing-specific requirements.

12.1. IPv6 Router Alert Option - RFC 2711

The IPv6 Router Alert Option [RFC2711] is an optional IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Header that is used in conjunction with some protocols (e.g., RSVP [RFC2205] or Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) [RFC2710]). The Router Alert option will need to be implemented whenever protocols that mandate its usage (e.g., MLD) are implemented. See Section 5.10.

12.2. Neighbor Discovery for IPv6 - RFC 4861

Sending Router Advertisements and processing Router Solicitations MUST be supported.

Section 7 of [RFC6275] includes some mobility-specific extensions to Neighbor Discovery. Routers SHOULD implement Sections 7.3 and 7.5, even if they do not implement Home Agent functionality.

12.3. Stateful Address Autoconfiguration (DHCPv6) - RFC 3315

A single DHCP server ([RFC3315] or [RFC4862]) can provide configuration information to devices directly attached to a shared link, as well as to devices located elsewhere within a site. Communication between a client and a DHCP server located on different links requires the use of DHCP relay agents on routers.

In simple deployments, consisting of a single router and either a single LAN or multiple LANs attached to the single router, together with a WAN connection, a DHCP server embedded within the router is one common deployment scenario (e.g., [RFC6204]). However, there is no need for relay agents in such scenarios.

In more complex deployment scenarios, such as within enterprise or service provider networks, the use of DHCP requires some level of configuration, in order to configure relay agents, DHCP servers, etc. In such environments, the DHCP server might even be run on a traditional server, rather than as part of a router.

Because of the wide range of deployment scenarios, support for DHCP server functionality on routers is optional. However, routers targeted for deployment within more complex scenarios (as described above) SHOULD support relay agent functionality. Note that "Basic Requirements for IPv6 Customer Edge Routers" [RFC6204] requires implementation of a DHCPv6 server function in IPv6 Customer Edge (CE) routers.

13. Network Management

Network management MAY be supported by IPv6 nodes. However, for IPv6 nodes that are embedded devices, network management may be the only possible way of controlling these nodes.

13.1. Management Information Base (MIB) Modules

The following two MIB modules SHOULD be supported by nodes that support a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) agent.

13.1.1. IP Forwarding Table MIB

The IP Forwarding Table MIB [RFC4292] SHOULD be supported by nodes that support an SNMP agent.

13.1.2. Management Information Base for the Internet Protocol (IP)

The IP MIB [RFC4293] SHOULD be supported by nodes that support an SNMP agent.

14. Security Considerations

This document does not directly affect the security of the Internet, beyond the security considerations associated with the individual protocols.

Security is also discussed in [Section 11](#) above.

15. Authors and Acknowledgments

15.1. Authors and Acknowledgments (Current Document)

For this version of the IPv6 Node Requirements document, the authors would like to thank Hitoshi Asaeda, Brian Carpenter, Tim Chown, Ralph Droms, Sheila Frankel, Sam Hartman, Bob Hinden, Paul Hoffman, Pekka Savola, Yaron Sheffer, and Dave Thaler for their comments.

15.2. Authors and Acknowledgments from [RFC 4279](#)

The original version of this document ([RFC 4279](#)) was written by the IPv6 Node Requirements design team:

Jari Arkko
jari.arkko@ericsson.com

Marc Blanchet
marc.blanchet@viagenie.qc.ca

Samita Chakrabarti
samita.chakrabarti@eng.sun.com

Alain Durand
alain.durand@sun.com

Gerard Gastaud
gerard.gastaud@alcatel.fr

Jun-ichiro Itojun Hagino
itojun@iijlab.net

Atsushi Inoue
inoue@isl.rdc.toshiba.co.jp

Masahiro Ishiyama
masahiro@isl.rdc.toshiba.co.jp

John Loughney
john.loughney@nokia.com

Rajiv Raghunarayan
raraghun@cisco.com

Shoichi Sakane
shoichi.sakane@jp.yokogawa.com

Dave Thaler
dthaler@windows.microsoft.com

Juha Wiljakka
juha.wiljakka@Nokia.com

The authors would like to thank Ran Atkinson, Jim Bound, Brian Carpenter, Ralph Droms, Christian Huitema, Adam Machalek, Thomas Narten, Juha Ollila, and Pekka Savola for their comments. Thanks to Mark Andrews for comments and corrections on DNS text. Thanks to Alfred Hoenes for tracking the updates to various RFCs.

16. Appendix: Changes from [RFC 4294](#)

There have been many editorial clarifications as well as significant additions and updates. While this section highlights some of the changes, readers should not rely on this section for a comprehensive list of all changes.

1. Updated the Introduction to indicate that this document is an applicability statement and is aimed at general nodes.
2. Significantly updated the section on Mobility protocols, adding references and downgrading previous SHOULDs to MAYs.
3. Changed Sub-IP Layer section to just list relevant RFCs, and added some more RFCs.
4. Added section on SEND (it is a MAY).
5. Revised section on Privacy Extensions [[RFC4941](#)] to add more nuance to recommendation.
6. Completely revised IPsec/IKEv2 section, downgrading overall recommendation to a SHOULD.
7. Upgraded recommendation of DHCPv6 to SHOULD.
8. Added background section on DHCP versus RA options, added SHOULD recommendation for DNS configuration via RAs [[RFC6106](#)], and cleaned up DHCP recommendations.
9. Added recommendation that routers implement Sections [7.3](#) and [7.5](#) of [[RFC6275](#)].
10. Added pointer to subnet clarification document [[RFC5942](#)].

11. Added text that "IPv6 Host-to-Router Load Sharing" [RFC4311] SHOULD be implemented.
12. Added reference to [RFC5722] (Overlapping Fragments), and made it a MUST to implement.
13. Made "A Recommendation for IPv6 Address Text Representation" [RFC5952] a SHOULD.
14. Removed mention of "DNAME" from the discussion about [RFC3363].
15. Numerous updates to reflect newer versions of IPv6 documents, including [RFC4443], [RFC4291], [RFC3596], and [RFC4213].
16. Removed discussion of "Managed" and "Other" flags in RAs. There is no consensus at present on how to process these flags, and discussion of their semantics was removed in the most recent update of Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [RFC4862].
17. Added many more references to optional IPv6 documents.
18. Made "A Recommendation for IPv6 Address Text Representation" [RFC5952] a SHOULD.
19. Added reference to [RFC5722] (Overlapping Fragments), and made it a MUST to implement.
20. Updated MLD section to include reference to Lightweight MLD [RFC5790].
21. Added SHOULD recommendation for "Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes" [RFC4191].
22. Made "IPv6 Flow Label Specification" [RFC6437] a SHOULD.

17. References

17.1. Normative References

- [RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", STD 13, RFC 1034, November 1987.
- [RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, RFC 1035, November 1987.
- [RFC1981] McCann, J., Deering, S., and J. Mogul, "Path MTU Discovery for IP version 6", RFC 1981, August 1996.

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2460] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), December 1998.
- [RFC2671] Vixie, P., "Extension Mechanisms for DNS (EDNS0)", [RFC 2671](#), August 1999.
- [RFC2710] Deering, S., Fenner, W., and B. Haberman, "Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6", [RFC 2710](#), October 1999.
- [RFC2711] Partridge, C. and A. Jackson, "IPv6 Router Alert Option", [RFC 2711](#), October 1999.
- [RFC3315] Droms, R., Bound, J., Volz, B., Lemon, T., Perkins, C., and M. Carney, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", [RFC 3315](#), July 2003.
- [RFC3484] Draves, R., "Default Address Selection for Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 3484](#), February 2003.
- [RFC3590] Haberman, B., "Source Address Selection for the Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Protocol", [RFC 3590](#), September 2003.
- [RFC3596] Thomson, S., Huitema, C., Ksinant, V., and M. Souissi, "DNS Extensions to Support IP Version 6", [RFC 3596](#), October 2003.
- [RFC3736] Droms, R., "Stateless Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) Service for IPv6", [RFC 3736](#), April 2004.
- [RFC3810] Vida, R. and L. Costa, "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", [RFC 3810](#), June 2004.
- [RFC4033] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements", [RFC 4033](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4034] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Resource Records for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4034](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4035] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Protocol Modifications for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4035](#), March 2005.

- [RFC4213] Nordmark, E. and R. Gilligan, "Basic Transition Mechanisms for IPv6 Hosts and Routers", [RFC 4213](#), October 2005.
- [RFC4291] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 4291](#), February 2006.
- [RFC4292] Haberman, B., "IP Forwarding Table MIB", [RFC 4292](#), April 2006.
- [RFC4293] Routhier, S., "Management Information Base for the Internet Protocol (IP)", [RFC 4293](#), April 2006.
- [RFC4301] Kent, S. and K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", [RFC 4301](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4303] Kent, S., "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", [RFC 4303](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4307] Schiller, J., "Cryptographic Algorithms for Use in the Internet Key Exchange Version 2 (IKEv2)", [RFC 4307](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4311] Hinden, R. and D. Thaler, "IPv6 Host-to-Router Load Sharing", [RFC 4311](#), November 2005.
- [RFC4443] Conta, A., Deering, S., and M. Gupta, "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 4443](#), March 2006.
- [RFC4604] Holbrook, H., Cain, B., and B. Haberman, "Using Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Protocol Version 2 (MLDv2) for Source-Specific Multicast", [RFC 4604](#), August 2006.
- [RFC4607] Holbrook, H. and B. Cain, "Source-Specific Multicast for IP", [RFC 4607](#), August 2006.
- [RFC4835] Manral, V., "Cryptographic Algorithm Implementation Requirements for Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) and Authentication Header (AH)", [RFC 4835](#), April 2007.
- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 4861](#), September 2007.
- [RFC4862] Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", [RFC 4862](#), September 2007.

- [RFC4941] Narten, T., Draves, R., and S. Krishnan, "Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration in IPv6", [RFC 4941](#), September 2007.
- [RFC5095] Abley, J., Savola, P., and G. Neville-Neil, "Deprecation of Type 0 Routing Headers in IPv6", [RFC 5095](#), December 2007.
- [RFC5453] Krishnan, S., "Reserved IPv6 Interface Identifiers", [RFC 5453](#), February 2009.
- [RFC5722] Krishnan, S., "Handling of Overlapping IPv6 Fragments", [RFC 5722](#), December 2009.
- [RFC5790] Liu, H., Cao, W., and H. Asaeda, "Lightweight Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) Protocols", [RFC 5790](#), February 2010.
- [RFC5942] Singh, H., Beebee, W., and E. Nordmark, "IPv6 Subnet Model: The Relationship between Links and Subnet Prefixes", [RFC 5942](#), July 2010.
- [RFC5952] Kawamura, S. and M. Kawashima, "A Recommendation for IPv6 Address Text Representation", [RFC 5952](#), August 2010.
- [RFC5996] Kaufman, C., Hoffman, P., Nir, Y., and P. Eronen, "Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2)", [RFC 5996](#), September 2010.
- [RFC6106] Jeong, J., Park, S., Beloeil, L., and S. Madanapalli, "IPv6 Router Advertisement Options for DNS Configuration", [RFC 6106](#), November 2010.
- [RFC6204] Singh, H., Beebee, W., Donley, C., Stark, B., and O. Troan, "Basic Requirements for IPv6 Customer Edge Routers", [RFC 6204](#), April 2011.
- [RFC6437] Amante, S., Carpenter, B., Jiang, S., and J. Rajahalme, "IPv6 Flow Label Specification", [RFC 6437](#), November 2011.

17.2. Informative References

- [DODv6] DISR IPv6 Standards Technical Working Group, "DoD IPv6 Standard Profiles For IPv6 Capable Products Version 5.0", July 2010, http://jitc.fhu.disa.mil/apl/ipv6/pdf/distr_ipv6_50.pdf.

- [POSIX] IEEE, "IEEE Std. 1003.1-2008 Standard for Information Technology -- Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX), ISO/IEC 9945:2009", <<http://www.ieee.org>>.
- [RFC0793] Postel, J., "Transmission Control Protocol", STD 7, [RFC 793](#), September 1981.
- [RFC2205] Braden, B., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), September 1997.
- [RFC2464] Crawford, M., "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Ethernet Networks", [RFC 2464](#), December 1998.
- [RFC2491] Armitage, G., Schulter, P., Jork, M., and G. Harter, "IPv6 over Non-Broadcast Multiple Access (NBMA) networks", [RFC 2491](#), January 1999.
- [RFC2492] Armitage, G., Schulter, P., and M. Jork, "IPv6 over ATM Networks", [RFC 2492](#), January 1999.
- [RFC2590] Conta, A., Malis, A., and M. Mueller, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Frame Relay Networks Specification", [RFC 2590](#), May 1999.
- [RFC2675] Borman, D., Deering, S., and R. Hinden, "IPv6 Jumbograms", [RFC 2675](#), August 1999.
- [RFC3146] Fujisawa, K. and A. Onoe, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 1394 Networks", [RFC 3146](#), October 2001.
- [RFC3363] Bush, R., Durand, A., Fink, B., Gudmundsson, O., and T. Hain, "Representing Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) Addresses in the Domain Name System (DNS)", [RFC 3363](#), August 2002.
- [RFC3493] Gilligan, R., Thomson, S., Bound, J., McCann, J., and W. Stevens, "Basic Socket Interface Extensions for IPv6", [RFC 3493](#), February 2003.
- [RFC3542] Stevens, W., Thomas, M., Nordmark, E., and T. Jinmei, "Advanced Sockets Application Program Interface (API) for IPv6", [RFC 3542](#), May 2003.
- [RFC3678] Thaler, D., Fenner, B., and B. Quinn, "Socket Interface Extensions for Multicast Source Filters", [RFC 3678](#), January 2004.

- [RFC3776] Arkko, J., Devarapalli, V., and F. Dupont, "Using IPsec to Protect Mobile IPv6 Signaling Between Mobile Nodes and Home Agents", [RFC 3776](#), June 2004.
- [RFC3971] Arkko, J., Kempf, J., Zill, B., and P. Nikander, "SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SEND)", [RFC 3971](#), March 2005.
- [RFC3972] Aura, T., "Cryptographically Generated Addresses (CGA)", [RFC 3972](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4191] Draves, R. and D. Thaler, "Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes", [RFC 4191](#), November 2005.
- [RFC4302] Kent, S., "IP Authentication Header", [RFC 4302](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4338] DeSanti, C., Carlson, C., and R. Nixon, "Transmission of IPv6, IPv4, and Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) Packets over Fibre Channel", [RFC 4338](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4380] Huitema, C., "Teredo: Tunneling IPv6 over UDP through Network Address Translations (NATs)", [RFC 4380](#), February 2006.
- [RFC4429] Moore, N., "Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) for IPv6", [RFC 4429](#), April 2006.
- [RFC4584] Chakrabarti, S. and E. Nordmark, "Extension to Sockets API for Mobile IPv6", [RFC 4584](#), July 2006.
- [RFC4821] Mathis, M. and J. Heffner, "Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery", [RFC 4821](#), March 2007.
- [RFC4877] Devarapalli, V. and F. Dupont, "Mobile IPv6 Operation with IKEv2 and the Revised IPsec Architecture", [RFC 4877](#), April 2007.
- [RFC4884] Bonica, R., Gan, D., Tappan, D., and C. Pignataro, "Extended ICMP to Support Multi-Part Messages", [RFC 4884](#), April 2007.
- [RFC4944] Montenegro, G., Kushalnagar, N., Hui, J., and D. Culler, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks", [RFC 4944](#), September 2007.
- [RFC5006] Jeong, J., Park, S., Beloeil, L., and S. Madanapalli, "IPv6 Router Advertisement Option for DNS Configuration", [RFC 5006](#), September 2007.

- [RFC5014] Nordmark, E., Chakrabarti, S., and J. Laganier, "IPv6 Socket API for Source Address Selection", [RFC 5014](#), September 2007.
- [RFC5072] S.Varada, Haskins, D., and E. Allen, "IP Version 6 over PPP", [RFC 5072](#), September 2007.
- [RFC5121] Patil, B., Xia, F., Sarikaya, B., Choi, JH., and S. Madanapalli, "Transmission of IPv6 via the IPv6 Convergence Sublayer over IEEE 802.16 Networks", [RFC 5121](#), February 2008.
- [RFC5555] Soliman, H., "Mobile IPv6 Support for Dual Stack Hosts and Routers", [RFC 5555](#), June 2009.
- [RFC6275] Perkins, C., Johnson, D., and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [RFC 6275](#), July 2011.
- [USGv6] National Institute of Standards and Technology, "A Profile for IPv6 in the U.S. Government - Version 1.0", July 2008, <<http://www.antd.nist.gov/usgv6/usgv6-v1.pdf>>.

Authors' Addresses

Ed Jankiewicz
SRI International, Inc.
333 Ravenswood Ave.
Menlo Park, CA 94025
USA

Phone: +1 443 502 5815
EMail: edward.jankiewicz@sri.com

John Loughney
Nokia
200 South Mathilda Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
USA

Phone: +1 650 283 8068
EMail: john.loughney@nokia.com

Thomas Narten
IBM Corporation
3039 Cornwallis Ave.
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2195
USA

Phone: +1 919 254 7798
EMail: narten@us.ibm.com