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Motivation:

• How could we evolve beyond current IPv6?
  • Several proposals / discussions in other parts of IETF.
  • With significant push-back, citing concerns about survival and stability of the Internet

• Claim: 128 bit addresses are not always a benefit... why?
  • Most answers circle around short addresses for small networks as more efficient on wire/air.
  • But IPv4 also felt easier than IPv6... So there seem to be operational aspects.

• So i tried to figure out the operational issues i have encountered.
  • Mostly in networks i would consider to be IoT or at least have strong IoT elements.
  • Manufacturing / Transportation – mostly not “constrained”

• And came up with some new extended addressing solution

• But: This presentation is just meant to discuss the operational issues.
  • Idea/Solution part itself to be presented later in the week in INTARA/RTGWG meeting

• And maybe the problem itself is worth more discussion in iotops
Problem: Arbitrary composition of networks with independent address spaces

- 90% TCP/IP systems are NOT “on the Internet”
  - Most not even “connected to the Internet” (heavy filtering / application gateways)

- Many challenges with IPv6 addressing.
  - PD – complex multihoming e.g.: IPv6 (S,D) forwarding, SP change causes renumbering, undesirable long prefix/host-parts (compression, management)
  - PI – loss of aggregation, admin/cost of assignment/delegation, limited space for extensibility (128 – 64 – prefixlength)
  - ULA – not “generic” addresses
    Worse than RFC1918 ?!

The IETF Protocol Iceberg
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Broad use of IETF ‘TCP/IP’ solutions:
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Access to Internet only in parts often also highly undesirable
The Smart Manufacturing “Network of Networks”

Internet

- Cloud Data-Center /Compute/ Store Networks (public)
- Component/OEM Networks
  Just in time order
- Customer Networks
  Predict maint
- Regulator/Security Networks
  Police / fire / ...

Industry federation network

Manufacturer Global Network

- Manufacturing Plant Network(s)
  - Assembly Line Network 1
    Sensors, motors/actors, cameras, PLC
  - Assembly Line Network N
    Sensors, motors/actors, cameras, PLC
  - Worker Network
    Phone, Safety Sensors, Camera RFID scanner, Task Actors, ...
  - Mobile Robot Networks
    Cameras
    Robots
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  - Security Mgmt
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Regulator/Security
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Global scope IPv4/Pv6 addresses should not be “burned in”. You don’t own them. You just lease them.

RFC1918 allows to manufacture equipment with “generic” addresses. Addresses you own forever. But must use NAT to interconnect.

Two tiers of composition can very easily be done with two tiers of stateless static NAT.

IPv6 worse ?! ULA (IPv6) not equivalent to RFC1918. Supposedly no NAT. Stochastical prefix collision. Still have only 16 bit “Subnet ID” to play with, same as Net 10.

Not just industrial issue.
What’s next?

• Pitch: If these problems look interesting, please check out solution proposal
  • Presented later in the week in INTAREA and RTGWG

• Forget future solutions:
  Is addressing for IoT networks/deployments something we could/should look more into in iotops?
  • Issues with owning addresses, being able to burn them into equipment as vendor
  • Issues of managing address space
  • Issues connecting multiple address spaces / NAT (especially for IPv6)
    • Do not think IPv6 with NA was a topic for BEHAVE WG (NAT WG).

• Addressing challenges/requirements for IoT networks docs?

• Very happy to discuss any issues encountered to brainstorm if/what we could do in IETF about it.
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