

Identification of ICT Technical Specifications

IPv6

Evaluation report

Management summary

This report contains the evaluation report as well as the proposed advice of the ICT multi stakeholder platform on the submission of specifications "IPv6" to be identified in accordance with Article 13 and Annex II (based on the WTO¹ standardisation principles) of Regulation (EU) No. 1025 /2012².

The report covers mainly the following structure:

- 1) Assessment of the compliance with the "market acceptance" and "coherence" criteria set by Annex II.1 & 2; providing information on the proposed ICT technical specification against the background of the formal European standardisation system and existing and/or on-going standardization activities in the relevant domain
- 2) Assessment of the characteristics of the organisation and its technical specification developing procedures in accordance with Annex II.3.
- 3) Assessment of the compliance against the requirements for the identification of ICT technical specifications, set by Annex II.4.

The Platform issued a positive advice on the identification on IPV6 as common technical specifications in the sense of art. 13 of the Regulation 1025/2012.

¹ World Trade Organisation

² Regulation (EU) No. 1025/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on European Standardisation. OJ L 316/12 of 14.11.2012

Evaluation Working Group IPv6

Report to the Platform

1 Objective for the report

1.1 The background

Economic growth and responsiveness to citizens' expectations in a digital world requires interoperability between services, applications and products. Achieving interoperability requires standards and specifications. Public authorities should make use of the full range of standards and technical specifications when procuring hardware, software and information technology services; this will allow them to efficiently fulfil their tasks. The Pillar II of the Digital Agenda for Europe recognised the need of sound standards and common technical specifications to promote interoperability, and advocates public authorities to make the use of available standards and common technical specifications when commissioning hardware, software and IT services from external suppliers.

To that objective the Regulation 1025/2012 on European standardisation lays down in its Chapter IV a procedure for the identification of ICT technical specifications which are not issued by European, International or national standardisation organisations that could be referenced in public procurement acts by public authorities, provided that these ICT specifications, proposed by the Commission or by Member States, comply with the requirements set by annex II of the same Regulation.

These requirements cover the coherence of the proposed ICT specification with the formal standardisation environment, the qualities of the standardisation process implemented in the standards setting organisation that issued the proposed ICT specification and some aspects of the proposed specification itself. Compliance with these requirements guarantees the public authorities that the proposed ICT specification are set in accordance with the founding principles recognised by the World Trade organisation (WTO) in the field of standardisation.

The objective for this report was to allow the European multi-stakeholder platform on ICT standardisation ("The Platform") evaluating compliance of the proposed ICT specification with the requirements set in annex II of the regulation. The Platform subsequently provided its positive advice to the Commission on the potential "identification" of the submitted ICT specification.

The European multi-stakeholder platform on ICT standardisation platform is an expert group set up by The Commission Decision of 28th November 2011; it is composed of representatives of Member States, Industry, societal organisations, formal standards organisation and fora & consortia. The art. 2.f of this Decision states that one of the tasks of the Platform is "*to advise the Commission on the identification of the technical specifications in the field of ICT which are not national, European or international standards*". The Platform agreed on a process for such identification (doc. ICT/MSP (2012) 057), in accordance with art. 13 of the Regulation 1024/2012.

1.2 The process

- On 13th September 2012 the European Commission has submitted a list of potential the ICT specifications to the evaluation process in view of their identification as an ICT specification eligible for referencing in public procurement, in accordance with article 13 of the Regulation on standardisation 1025/2012. Out of this list the Platform agreed at its meeting of 25th October 2012 to start an identification procedure of the technical specifications "IPv6" issued by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), selected by the Platform with other three ("XML", "ECMA Script" and "802.11"). The "identified ICT specifications" resulting from this process, in accordance with art. 14 of Regulation 1025/2012, shall constitute a "common technical

specification" referred to in Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC and 2009/81/EC and therefore become eligible for direct referencing in public procurement

- An informal team was set up, chaired by the Commission and with the help of a representative of the organisation originating the technical specification, IETF, to complete the submission file.
- The secretariat of the ICT standardisation multi stakeholder platform has verified whether the information on the evaluation submission form is complete. The submission form has subsequently been forwarded on 14th January 2013 to the members of the Platform for discussion and for the establishment of an evaluation group to assess this information with respect to the requirements set by the Annex II of the Regulation
- The Platform noted the submission of the ICT specification IPv6 issued by IETF at its meeting of 7th February 2013; the Platform decided to established an ad hoc evaluation working group to carefully analyse the data provided by the submission form; to seek, if necessary, further information from the submitter and the specification originating organisation and to consolidate the information in an evaluation report addressed to the Platform, which will allow the Platform to prepare its advice on the identification of the proposed ICT specification to the Commission.
- The MSP discussed the report and the draft advice at its meeting of 13th June 2013. The Platform secretariat subsequently updated the draft advice in accordance with the outcome of the MSP discussion. The final advice was approve at the Platform meeting of 17th October 2013.
- The final draft advice will be submitted for broad consultation to all interested stakeholders via the Yourvoice in Europe web site; the consultation will last at least one month.
- The MSP Secretariat will consolidate the comments received during the open consultation and submit to the Platform for further action.
- The Platform will, depending on the outcome of the consultation, decide on the finalisation of its draft advice to the Commission or on further discussion within the MSP.
- Further to a positive advice of the MSP, the Commission will, in accordance with the internal procedures, prepare the relevant Commission decision on the identification of the ICT specification.

1.3 Evaluation group

Following its decision of 25th October 2013, the Platform agreed on its meeting of 7th February 2013 to create an evaluation group for IPv6 on a voluntary basis: all the members of the Platform could volunteer to be part of this task force. A representative of IETF as specification setting organisation, participated in an advisory basis. ; a Commission representative ensures the Secretariat of the Platform.

The Evaluation group was composed of representatives from the following Platform members:

1. European Commission)
2. IETF (advisor)
3. DIGITALEUROPE
4. IEEE
5. OASIS
6. CEN/CENELEC
7. Belgium
8. Switzerland

The secretariat of the group was assured by the Commission.

The evaluation group has performed its tasks by electronic means, including call conferences when needed. The group and delivered its preliminary report to the MSP secretariat on 30th May 2013, and presented it to the Platform on its meeting of 13th June 2013.

1.4 Subject of the evaluation

This evaluation report covers a set of specifications that are needed to support public procurement of IPv6 enabled technology, the IPv6 specifications.

IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6) is the successor of IPv4 needed to allow growth in the amount of nodes connected to the global internet, by increasing addressable space from 32 bits (roughly 4 Billion addresses) to 128 bits.

IPv6 comprises a set of specifications that have been developed over a period of roughly 20 years by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) ³ and have been documented in 'Requests For Comments' (RFC). IETF RFCs usually focus on small technical areas of a broader architecture. This is no different with IPv6. Multiple RFCs will need to be implemented to achieve interoperability for certain applicability domains. For instance, a router that implements IPv6 will need to implement a different set of RFCs than a mobile handset that supports IPv6.

There have been multiple efforts to publish comprehensive lists of RFCs that are required for IPv6 support for certain product ranges.

- RIPE 554 "Requirements for IPv6 in ICT Equipment", June 2012, <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/current-ripe-documents/ripe-554>
- 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>
- DISR IPv6 Standards Technical Working Group, "DoD IPv6 Standard Profiles For IPv6 Capable Products Version 5.0", July 2010, http://jtc.fhu.disa.mil/apl/ipv6/pdf/dsr_ipv6_50.pdf
- RFC 6434, "IPv6 Node Requirements", December 2011, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc6434.txt>
- RFC 6204, "Basic Requirements for IPv6 Customer Edge Routers", April 2011, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc6204.txt>

RFC 6434 and 6204 form the basis for the list of RFCs that are needed to implement the most common IPv6 features in the most common equipment. The goal of the list is to allow procurement of a broad set of equipment and services needed to implement IPv6.

Typically, somebody procuring for IPv6 equipment would take RFC 6204 or RFC 6434 and match RFCs to requirements.

Obviously not every procurement of IPv6 will need to refer to the complete list. Procurers will need to understand which requirements for which they need to procure and select the specifications that match those requirements. *E.g.* a sentence as "The rules specified in the Default Address Selection for IPv6 [RFC3484] document MUST be implemented. " indicates that all implementations must support RFC3484 whereas the sentence "If an IPv6 node implements dual stack and tunnelling, then [RFC4213] MUST be supported" indicates that if the procurer requires tunnelling functionality then RFC4213 needs to be referenced.

The references above can be of assist the procurer in making the relevant choices.

Annexed to this report there is a table listing the most relevant RFCs.

1.5 Possible links with other ICT technical specifications or standards

IPv6 is the successor to the widely used IPv4 protocol, which is a fundamental protocol for the Internet. Higher protocols like UDP and TCP build upon IP lower layer protocols like ethernet deliver IP.

³ www.ietf.org

2 Evaluation of compliance with the general conditions

2.1 Market acceptance

As stated above, “IPv6 support” constitutes a long list of specifications. Depending on the context and the application, different subsets of these lists are needed to allow products or services to interact successfully. Therefore, a minimum set of requirements should be agreed upon.

An implementation of IPv6 can also implement other standards or specifications, including European and international standards in the same domain, without loss of interoperability.

IPv6 support has already been implemented in e.g. various operating systems, web servers and popular online services like search engines and multimedia sites.

Some ISPs already provide their customers with IPv6 addresses, and several governments have started to enable IPv6 on public websites, allowing citizens and companies to browse government websites and use online services over IPv6 using their preferred browser.

Mainly because of the increasing number of internet-enabled devices and internet users (both human and machine users), the IPv4 protocol has reached its limits and a new (set of) protocol is needed to support the continuing growth of the internet.

IPv6 it is a way to future-proof the internet.

Technology providers are increasingly producing and selling network-enabled products / services implementing the IPv6 specification. This includes – but is not limited to:

- software, e.g. operating systems, web clients and web servers
- hardware appliances, e.g. firewalls, sensors, home automation systems
- online services, e.g. delivery of multimedia content, web statistics

Solutions are available for professional and consumer use.

The specification has been implemented globally.

2.2 Coherence with the formal European standardisation environment

2.2.1 The specification covers a domain where the adoption of a new European or international standard or standardisation deliverable is not foreseen within a reasonable period.

Yes, a European or International standardisation deliverable is not foreseen.

2.2.2 The current scope of the formal European or international standardisation organisations does not cover any similar domain

Not Applicable

2.2.3 Transposition of the proposed ICT technical specification into a European or international standard or standardisation is not foreseen within a reasonable period.

No

3 Evaluation of compliance with the attributes

3.1 The organisation developing the specification

Summary: the IPv6 specifications are approved and will be maintained by a non for profit organisation. The development of the specifications is based on open and transparent processes, participation by all relevant stakeholders is possible, and decisions are taken on the basis of consensus.

The specification has been developed and is maintained by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). IETF is a non-profit making organisation. IETF develops standards in the field of ICT, namely Internet related.

What follows is an informal narrative, for a full overview of authoritative documents see <http://www.ietf.org/about/process-docs.html>

The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) is the premiere Internet standards organization. Its aim is to make the Internet work better by producing high quality, relevant technical documents that influence the way people design, use, and manage the Internet.

The IETF is the principal body engaged in the development of new Internet standard specifications. The IETF is unusual in that it exists as a collection of happenings, but is not a corporation and has no board of directors, no members, and no dues; see [BCP95], "A Mission Statement for the IETF", for more detail.

Its mission includes the following:

- Identifying, and proposing solutions to, pressing operational and technical problems in the Internet
- Specifying the development or usage of protocols and the near-term architecture to solve such technical problems for the Internet
- Making recommendations to the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) regarding the standardization of protocols and protocol usage in the Internet
- Facilitating technology transfer from the Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) to the wider Internet community
- Providing a forum for the exchange of information within the Internet community between vendors, users, researchers, agency contractors, and network managers

The IETF meeting is not a conference, although there are technical presentations. The IETF is not a traditional standards organization, although many specifications that are produced become standards. The IETF is made up of volunteers, many of whom meet three times a year to fulfil the IETF mission.

There is no membership in the IETF. Anyone may register for a meeting and then attend. The closest thing there is to being an IETF member is being on the IETF or Working Group mailing lists

Financial and legal support for the IETF⁴ is provided by the Internet Society (ISOC). ISOC maintains the books and is hired the IETF's directly employed administrative staff.

The Internet Society is an international not-for-profit organization concerned with the growth and evolution of the worldwide Internet and with the social, political, and technical issues that arise from its use. The ISOC is an organization with individual and organizational members. The ISOC is managed by a Board of Trustees elected by the worldwide individual membership.

4 And the related and/or supporting organisations such as the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), the Internet Research Task Force (IRTF), the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), and the RFC Editor.

The way in which the members of the ISOC Board of Trustees are selected, and other matters concerning the operation of the Internet Society, are described in the ISOC By Laws [C].

3.2 The development process

The Internet Standards Process is documented in RFC2026, as updated by RFC6410. Again, what follows is an informal narrative.

IETF has no specific membership rules; participation to IETF standardisation activities is open to all on the basis of direct participation. The decision process is based on rough consensus (decision by the chairman of the technical group on the basis of the dominant position in the group).

The Internet Standards Process is an **open, transparent, consensus based process**.

3.2.a IETF rules and procedures

3.2.a.1 Standardization process

IETF document BCP 9, found in RFC 2026 and RFC 6410, specifies the process used by the Internet community for the standardization of protocols and procedures. It defines the stages in the standardization process, the requirements for moving a document between stages and the types of documents used during this process. It also addresses the intellectual property rights and copyright issues associated with the standards process.

IETF publishes the RFC series of documents structured as follows:

Main series	Document status
Standards track	
	Internet Standard (STD)
	Proposed Standard
	Best Current Practice (BCP)
Non-standards track	
	Informational
	Experimental
	Historic

The document status Draft Standard will be eliminated by October 2013, as it caused confusion with Internet Drafts, which are drafts awaiting publication.

3.2.a.2 Standards track maturity levels

Specifications become Internet Standards through a set of two maturity levels known as the "Standards Track". These maturity levels are "Proposed Standard" and "Internet Standard".

“Internet Standard” maturity level is attributed to an RFC after confirmation of the following criteria:

- a) There are at least two independent interoperating implementations with widespread deployment and successful operational experience.
- b) There are no errata against the specification that would cause an implementation to fail to interoperate with deployed ones.
- c) There are no unused features in the specification that greatly increase implementation complexity.
- d) If the technology required to implement the specification requires patented or otherwise controlled technology, then the set of implementations must demonstrate at least two independent, separate and successful uses of the licensing process.

The IETF Standards Process no longer requires a formal interoperability report, recognizing that deployment and use is sufficient to show interoperability.

"Proposed Standard" is the entry-level maturity for the standards track. A specific action by the IESG is required to move a specification onto the standards track at the "Proposed Standard" level.

3.2.a.3 Non-standards track maturity levels

Non-standards track specifications may be published directly as "Experimental" or "Informational" RFCs at the discretion of the RFC Editor in consultation with the IESG. They are not subject to the rules for Internet standardization and do not represent an Internet community consensus or recommendation.

3.2.a.4 Proposed standards

While INTERNET STANDARDS have passed a formal quality assessment as required by BCP 9, this is not the case for RFCs of "Proposed Standard" maturity level or non-standards track specifications. However, from the almost 7,000 published RFCs only 94 are INTERNET STANDARDS, some 2,500 Proposed Standards and some 2,100 "Informational".

While 4.1.1 of RFC 2026 recommends implementers to treat Proposed Standards as immature specifications without stability guarantee, IETF representatives point out that the industry does not generally invest into formal assessment of the "Internet Standard" requirements.

Therefore "Proposed Standard" maturity level indicates either of the following:

- The specification has not undergone formal quality assessment.
- The specification has failed formal quality assessment.

3.2.1. Openness

Open: interested parties can join mailing lists (with public archives) without charge and participate in the development of the specification and the development of the consensus. Face to face meetings are organized 3 times per year⁵ and allow for remote participation.

3.2.2. Consensus

Consensus: IETF Standards are subject to IETF consensus as judged by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), a management body consisting of 12 members. The consensus determination includes a 2 or 4 week '*last call*' on the public IETF mailinglist. Determination of consensus can be appealed through a well-defined 3 step appeal process (involving the IESG, the Internet Architecture Board –IAB–, and ISOC).

3.2.3. Transparency

Transparency: Public archives of the mailinglists are maintained, records of meetings are published in proceedings, and decisions by the IESG are minuted and made available publicly.

3.3 The specification

3.3.1. Maintenance

Updating of a specification is done through the publication of a new set of RFCs.

IETF exists since 1986 and has proven to be a stable organisation, which has been developing and maintaining standards over a long period. The various specifications are maintained in the different relevant working groups part of the IETF structure.

It should be pointed out that no review cycle is imposed on Standards Track documents at any maturity level. Updating of specifications is undertaken upon request from IETF members.

3.3.2. Availability

⁵ Sometimes working groups organize interim-meetings.

All IETF specifications are available for free download from <http://www.rfc-editor.org/>

3.3.3. Intellectual Property rules

The IETF intellectual property rights rules are defined in RFC 3979 (<http://www.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc3979.txt>), "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology" (updated by RFC 4879 (<http://www.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc4879.txt>), "Clarification of the Third Party Disclosure Procedure in RFC 3979").

The policy with respect to IPR (patents) can be summarized as followed:

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in any IETF documents or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights.

Contributors to the IETF process are expected to disclose the existence of IPR in technology.

The IETF Executive Director is expected to receive written assurance that a FRAND license (possibly royalty free) will be made available, or that no license will be required. In fact, while there is a preference for royalty-free licensing, the IETF working groups may opt to prefer technology that is known to have FRAND or even no known licensing terms.

The absence of IPR disclosures is not the same thing as the knowledge that there will be no IPR claims in the future. The validity and enforceability of any IPR may be challenged for legitimate reasons, and the mere existence of an IPR disclosure should not automatically be taken to mean that the disclosed IPR is valid or enforceable. In fact IETF Working Groups will take into account on their own opinions of the validity, enforceability or applicability of IPR in their evaluation of alternative technologies.

The IETF's licensing policy is nuanced and in a summary it is not possible to describe in detail those nuances; the reader is advised to carefully read 3979 if there are any concerns.

Participants to the IETF process are being made aware of the IPR policies by means of the so called "NOTE WELL" that is shown at working group meetings, during registration, when subscribing to a mailing list, etc.

The table in the annex includes the list of RSC and the IPR regime applicable to them.

Disclaimer: The table includes the IPR disclosures, the date of verification, and interpretation comments from the supporting member of the evaluation group on the scope of the disclosures, without detailed analysis of them.

Copyright

In addition to IPR in the technology there is IPR on the 'words', or copyright.

Copyright procedures and copyright holders have changed over time (see <http://trustee.ietf.org/docs/IETF-Copyright-FAQ.pdf> for a good entry into copyright issues). The procedures describe how Contributors to the IETF process provide license to the IETF.

For recent documents (say 2006 onward) the copyright of RFCs is with the IETF Trust. (A Trust under the laws of the Virginia Commonwealth, the Trust members are IETF officials for details see <http://trustee.ietf.org>)

For documents written between April 1 1994 and 2006 specific right, and later full copyright, have been with ISOC.

For RFCs published between 1969 and 1994 information on rights and permissions must be sought directly from persons claiming rights therein.

In general everybody is licensed to copy, translate and redistribute RFCs in full. The IETF itself is licensed to copy and modify the contributions but 3rd parties will need to be licensed to develop derivative works. These terms allow the IETF to maintain a specification.

For more detail read RFC 5378 and the Trust Legal Provisions at <http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/>

3.3.4. Relevance

The adoption of IPv6 is supported by the Digital Agenda for Europe (<http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/internet>). However, this does not imply that each and every IPv6 specification is in line with regulatory requirements.

IPv6 is effective because it expands the number of available IP addresses, thereby enabling new Internet scenarios such as Internet of Things.

The relevance of the specification has been recognized by the Commission through the creation of an IPv6 task force (<http://www.eu.ipv6tf.org/in/i-index.php>) and in public speeches by the Commissioner in charge of the Digital Agenda (e.g. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-837_en.htm)

The Standardisation Forum, Dutch expert group, has recommended to include IPv6 by in the list of open standards for 'Comply or Explain' (http://www.forumstandaardisatie.nl/fileadmin/os/documenten/Expertadvies_IPv6_Eng.pdf)

3.3.5. Neutrality and stability

IPv6 technology is not expected to distort the market or limit implementers to develop competition and innovation based upon its specifications. IPv6 is needed for the deployment of new services IP based.

While IPv6 is not compatible with IPv4, products and services may support both (sets of) protocols, which is done frequently by developers of new products and services.

IPv6 is based on advanced technological developments.

3.3.6. Quality

Is the quality of the specification such that competing implementations are possible (without hampering interoperability) and ensure no hidden interfaces controlled by other organisations than the originating SDO are included?

The quality of IPv6 specifications permit the development of different competing implementations of interoperable products and services. There are already multiple competing implementations. IPv6 allows compliance of privacy regulation.

The IPv6 specifications may depend on lower layer capabilities that are developed by other standardisation development organisations. Those specifications are referenced and readily available.

4.- Summary and conclusion

The Evaluation Group has evaluated the "IPv6 specifications" supporting IPv6 technology as a whole rather than each related technical specification individually.

The Evaluation Group believes that as such, "IPv6 specifications" comply with the requirements for the identification of ICT technical specifications, set by Annex II of Regulation (EU) No. 1025/2012.

In particular IPv6 fulfils the general conditions indicated in the Annex II, i.e., has market acceptance and is coherent with the standards published by the formal European standardisation organisations, i.e., there is no duplication with existing standards or on-going standardisation activities. The proposed ICT specification is complementary to the European standards established by CEN, CENELEC and ETSI. No transposition of IPv6 into a formal European or international standard is currently foreseen.

The Organisation that develops the IPv6 specifications, IETF, complies with the attributes referred in the Annex II, i.e., is an open, transparent, non-profit organisation with expertise in developing standards in the field of ICT. Participation to IETF standardisation activities is open to all interested parties. Decisions are based on consensus building within the technical committees; IETF is taking care of maintenance. The IETF specifications are freely available for download. IETF does not impose IPR on its specifications. IETF favours that IPR are provided licence-free or licensed in a FRAND basis.

The IETF process as documented in RFC 2026 and RFC 6410 provides various levels of quality assurance. INTERNET STANDARDS are assured to be neutral, stable, interoperable and to have passed formal quality assessment. PROPOSED STANDARDS are assured to be generally stable, to have resolved known design choices, to be believed to be well-understood, to have received significant community review, and to appear to enjoy enough community interest to be considered valuable. However, further experience might result in their change or even retraction, and implementers should treat them as immature specifications.

While the group has not evaluated all PROPOSED STANDARDS on an individual basis, it shares the common view that they have a level of detail sufficient to permit the development of a variety of competing implementations of interoperable products or services. Therefore all specifications on the list in the annex are recommended for identification. However, MSP members may request at any time an evaluation of a specific RFC. Of course, such a request should be substantiated with some negative findings e.g. regarding interoperability

IPv6 is a stable technology, there is ample expertise available with respect to the use of IPv6 specifications and products implementing IPv6 are available on the market. The use of IPv6 is growing.

IPv6 has the potential to increase interoperability; implementing IPv6 may contribute to avoidance of vendor lock in.

The implementation of IPv6 will provide better accessibility and continuity especially for public services to be delivered by the public administrations. Continuity with future development is guaranteed.

Therefore the Evaluation Group proposes to the Platform to

- a) identify positively the ICT specifications found in the IPv6 Technical Specifications list as common technical specifications of IPv6 technology in the sense of art. 14 of the Regulation 1025/2013,
- b) to consider at any time requests from MSP members to re-evaluate a particular specification on this list,
- c) to exclude non-standards track documents from identification,
- d) notice the commitment of the proposer of this submission to regularly update the IPv6 Technical Specifications list.

The Platform issued a positive advice on the identification on IPV6 as common technical specifications in the sense of art. 13 of the Regulation 1025/2012.