

Internet Engineering Task Force  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: January 17, 2013

R. Despres  
RD-IPtech  
July 16, 2012

**Feature Analysis Tool for stateless IPv4/IPv6 (MAP-T, MAP-E, 4rd)  
draft-despres-softwire-stateless-analysis-tool-02**

Abstract

This document proposes a discussion tool for the Softwire meeting at IETF 84 in Vancouver.

Significant differentiating features between the MAP approach (proposed standards MAP-T and MAP-E) and the unified approach (proposed standard 4rd) are presented in tabular format.

Its purpose is to facilitate decision making, and is therefore temporary.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 17, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 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.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Feature-Comparison Tables . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
	Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>

## **1. Introduction**

Stateless solutions that are proposed for residual IPv4 service across IPv6-only networks will be discussed at IETF 84 in Vancouver, July 27 to August 3 2012. This document proposes a tool to facilitate common understanding during these discussions, and thus facilitate decision making on what to standardize and why.

It contains tables in which, for each of the major proposed specifications, MAP-T, MAP-E and 4rd, the most significant differentiating features are listed:

- o Table 1 deals with features that depend on whether IPv4 packets are twice translated (MAP-T), tunneled with packet encapsulation (MAP-E), or tunneled with reversible IPv4/IPv6 header translation (4rd).
- o Table 2 deals with features that depend on how IPv6 addresses are derived from IPv4 addresses, plus ports if applicable. Table 3 deals with miscellaneous features.

Documents used are:

- o [[I-D.ietf-softwire-map](#)] for MAP-T and MAP-E
- o [[I-D.ietf-softwire-4rd](#)] for 4rd

Issues identified on the tracker of [trac.tools.ietf.org/wg/softwire/trac/report/1](http://trac.tools.ietf.org/wg/softwire/trac/report/1) are referenced by their ticket numbers.



## 2. Feature-Comparison Tables

	Features that depend on	MAP-T	MAP-E	4rd	Issue #
	header formats				in
					tracker
H1	IPv6-only ACLs applicable to IPv4 packets	Y	N	Y	
H2	Support of DF=1 fragmented packets (required by <a href="#">RFC4821</a> )	N	Y	Y	#8
H3	Max performance where TCP/IPv6 is faster than TCP/IPv4/IPv6	Y	N	Y	#9
H4	For shared-address CEs, support of DCCP, UDP lite, and any future protocols using port fields and checksum algorithm of TCP	N	Y	Y	
H5	IPv6 congestion notifications of <a href="#">RFC 3168</a> forwarded in IPv4	Y	N	Y	
H6	Null-checksum UDP datagrams cannot be sent to wrong destinations with valid checksums	N	Y	Y	#6

Table 1

	Features that depend on IPv6	MAP-T	4rd	Issue #
	address formats	and		in
		MAP-E		tracker
A1	Applicability to sites that use subnet ID = 0	N	Y	#5
A2	Applicability to CEs that are behind third-party CPEs	N	Y	
A3	IPv6 addresses of IPv4 endpoints are recognizable without knowledge of Domain mapping rules (for ACLs etc.)	N	Y	

Despres

Expires January 17, 2013

[Page 4]

Table 2

	Miscellaneous	MAP	MAP	4rd	Issue #
		-T	-E		in
					tracker
M1	IPv6 Packet reassembly never needed in BRs	Y	N	Y	#3
M3	BR-CE compatibility guaranteed by the number of mapping rules	N	N	Y	
	CEs MUST be able to support				
M4	IP header length	40	60	40	
		or	or	or	
		48	68	48	

Table 3

### 3. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-softwire-4rd]

Despres, R., Penno, R., Lee, Y., Chen, G., S. Jiang, and M. Chen "IPv4 Residual Deployment via IPv6 - a unified Stateless Solution (4rd)", [draft-ietf-softwire-4rd-03](#) (work in progress), July 2012.

[I-D.ietf-softwire-map]

Troan, O., Dec, W., Li, X., Bao, C., Zhai, Y., Matsushima, S., and T. Murakami, "Mapping of Address and Port (MAP)", [draft-ietf-softwire-map-01](#) (work in progress), June 2012.

#### Author's Address

Remi Despres  
RD-IPtech  
3 rue du President Wilson  
Levallois,  
France

Email: [despres.remi@laposte.net](mailto:despres.remi@laposte.net)

