

Workgroup: v6ops  
Internet-Draft:  
draft-lencse-v6ops-transition-benchmarking-00  
Published: 16 October 2021  
Intended Status: Informational  
Expires: 19 April 2022  
Authors: G. Lencse

Szechenyi Istvan University  
**Performance Analysis of IPv6 Transition Technologies for IPv4aaS**

## **Abstract**

Several IPv6 transition technologies have been developed to provide customers with IPv4-as-a-Service (IPv4aaS) for ISPs with an IPv6-only access and/or core network. All these technologies have their advantages and disadvantages, and depending on existing topology, skills, strategy and other preferences, one of these technologies may be the most appropriate solution for a network operator.

This document examines and compares the performance of some free software implementations of the five most prominent IPv4aaS technologies (464XLAT, Dual Stack Lite, Lightweight 4over6, MAP-E, MAP-T).

## **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 <https://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 19 April 2022.

## **Copyright Notice**

Copyright (c) 2021 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 (<https://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

- [1. Introduction](#)
  - [1.1. Requirements Language](#)
- [2. Acknowledgements](#)
- [3. IANA Considerations](#)
- [4. Security Considerations](#)
- [5. References](#)
  - [5.1. Normative References](#)
  - [5.2. Informative References](#)
- [Appendix A. Change Log](#)
  - [A.1. 00](#)
- [Author's Address](#)

## 1. Introduction

IETF has standardized several IPv6 transition technologies [[LEN2019](#)] and occupied a neutral position trusting the selection of the most appropriate ones to the market. [[I-D.ietf-v6ops-transition-comparison](#)] provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of the five most prominent IPv4aaS technologies to assist operators with this problem. This document adds one more detail: performance analysis and comparison of the examined IPv4aaS technologies.

Currently this document is a stub. It has been created to provide a citable reference for the above mentioned I-D.

### 1.1. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP14 [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## 2. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank ... TBD

## 3. IANA Considerations

This document does not make any request to IANA.

## 4. Security Considerations

TBD.

## 5. References

### 5.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8219] Georgescu, M., Pislaru, L., and G. Lencse, "Benchmarking Methodology for IPv6 Transition Technologies", RFC 8219, DOI 10.17487/RFC8219, August 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8219>>.

### 5.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-v6ops-transition-comparison] Lencse, G., Martinez, J. P., Howard, L., Patterson, R., and I. Farrer, "Pros and Cons of IPv6 Transition Technologies for IPv4aaS", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-v6ops-transition-comparison-00, 15 April 2021, <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-v6ops-transition-comparison-00.txt>>.
- [LEN2019] Lencse, G. and Y. Kadobayashi, "Comprehensive Survey of IPv6 Transition Technologies: A Subjective Classification for Security Analysis", IEICE Transactions on Communications, vol. E102-B, no.10, pp. 2021-2035., DOI: 10.1587/transcom.2018EBR0002, 1 October 2019, <[http://www.hit.bme.hu/~lencse/publications/e102-b\\_10\\_2021.pdf](http://www.hit.bme.hu/~lencse/publications/e102-b_10_2021.pdf)>.
- [LEN2020] Lencse, G., "Adding RFC 4814 Random Port Feature to Siitperf: Design, Implementation and Performance Estimation", International Journal of Advances in Telecommunications, Electrotechnics, Signals and Systems, vol 9, no 3, pp. 18-26, DOI: 10.11601/ijates.v9i3.291, 2020, <<http://www.hit.bme.hu/~lencse/publications/291-1113-1-PB.pdf>>.
- [LEN2021] Lencse, G., "Design and Implementation of a Software Tester for Benchmarking Stateless NAT64 Gateways", IEICE Transactions on Communications, DOI: 10.1587/transcom.

2019EBN0010, 2021, <<http://www.hit.bme.hu/~lencse/publications/IEICE-2020-siitperf-revised.pdf>>.

## **Appendix A. Change Log**

### **A.1. 00**

Initial version.

### **Author's Address**

Gabor Lencse  
Szechenyi Istvan University  
Gyor  
Egyetem ter 1.  
H-9026  
Hungary

Email: [lencse@sze.hu](mailto:lencse@sze.hu)