

1. Chair Fred presented the agenda
2. Paolo Volpato presented "IPv6 deployment status"
  - a. Dhruv Dhody thinks this is an important document (from the meetecho)
  - b. Paolo asked for WG LC. Fred and Ron agreed. LC to start in 7-10 days
3. Martin Hunek presented "NAT64/DNS64 detection via SRV Records". All current mechanisms do not work in all cases (with detailed explanation). PTR records instead of DNSSL. Github code.
  - a. Jordi: not against the draft but some questions: RFC7225 is being used by some ISPs. should not be ignored. Not sure RFC8115 can be used for NAT64. CPE, OS (iOS/Android) when using NAT64, 464XLAT have well known prefix preconfigured. DNS64 pre-synthesis is a good thing to be done in the host. PTR is not used by Enterprises (although it should be). Do we really need additional document?
    - i. Answer: our method is more universal – no need for host configuration. Most deployments using WKP, document on practical use cases for specific prefix
  - b. Ralf Weber: You say PTR is the entry point. but didn't see it in the draft. in ADD we have similar problem upgrading DNS servers. we decided against PTR. may not be available
  - c. Ralf: no example for closed domain on how to use PTR. The search on the domains upward may be difficult to understand where to stop.
  - d. Martin: Yeah, you can use it dynamically PTR in your host. If there is no record, you move up a label.
  - e. Ted Lemon: document using PTR but doesn't say how it's done. aware of RFC6753 DNS-SD? read on this discovery mechanism
    - i. Martin: not aware of RFC6753.
    - ii. Ted: When you have secure delegation in PTR, you will have guard.. validate \*can\* have secure delegation, requires ISP to be doing things. Could connect to RPKI validation model
  - f. Jen: Looks like you prioritize this above RA. RA would be implemented soon. Interaction between mechanisms are not properly specified. What if IPv4 present.
    - i. Martin: I hope people will see. But I see that the operator will not change for years. I like the RA option for protection. Every application can access DNS. If it comes from the same prefix then there is no point.
  - g. Toerless Eckert: goal is to make it easy, use simple library on top of existing libraries. Given a long list of not easily adopted options, missing thing is abstract API spec how applications can discover/utilize the mapping information. can enhance service/backend without changing the API
  - h. Fred: move to list
4. Gabor Lencse, Scalability of IPv6 Transition Technologies for IPv4aaS
  - a. Michael Richardson (on MeetEcho): question about teardown rate: if we have millions of HTTP/1.1 and/or QUIC connections which don't really get torn down, but just hang around because actually the client device disconnected/moved... then the connections will mostly just timeout, right? is that a different kind of teardown?
  - b. Could expired connections between torn down as a group, perhaps using a single table lock for thousands of dead connections?
  - c. Fred: comments to the list, including adoption call

5. XiPeng Xiao presented “ND deployment guidelines”
  - a. Jared Mauch (wearing owner of home ISP hat): enabled V6, in my deployment case do I need to allocate a lot more v6 space, so they can have a /64 per device?
    - i. Xipeng: we know some allocate a /56 or a /48. But in our proposal, we only propose different prefixes for different hosts, we don’t care prefix size. You should decide the size yourself.
  - b. Jared: thinking about embedded devices, printer/home not on same subnet, printing stops. will ring the ISP
    - i. XiPeng: in a home environment where you need mDNS, then we don’t propose host isolation.
  - c. Eric: if 2 hosts with same link local addresses, is it ok?
    - i. XiPeng: since they are in different subnets and different L2, it’s ok
  - d. Lorenzo: duplicate IP addresses, how can it be ok?
    - i. Another person: they are on different prefixes can’t have same IP address.  
XiPeng: right. GUA will not be duplicate.
  - e. Lorenzo: your draft said host should register its IP address at the router, then host can attack router, because each host can generate a million IP address
    - i. XiPeng: router will only maintain prefix not IP address but will check offline about the statement you mentioned. Offline check result: that paragraph was summarizing another solution, Wireless ND. That is not what the draft is recommending
  - f. Fred: comments to list
6. Chongfeng Xie presented “Requirements to Multi-domain IPv6-only Network”
  - a. Fred: planning to propose a framework as mentioned in the slides?
    - i. Chongfeng: want feedback/comments, then consider providing the framework.
  - b. Fred: it would be good to see a proposed framework.
    - i. Chongfeng: have been doing field trials. Fred: between you and CERNET
  - c. Ron queue for discussion, take to tracker. Ask author for WG adoption call interest
7. Eric Vyncke presented “Just Another Measurement of Extension header Survivability (JAMES)”:  
A follow up measurement from RFC 7872. Looking for VMs in China and Africa
  - a. Gorry Fairhurst: (meetecho) I liked the presentation on measuring EH - but I really worry if people draw conclusions from specific measurements. I expect probing methodology and probe / target location can really have an influence on what we conclude. We are also making current measurements with a different method and different vantage point, and likely different conclusions. I think we could really benefit from combining a range of measurements If we wish to use this to inform FUTURE standards ...
  - b. Many people want to comment but Fred said go to list (not enough time).
8. Chair Ron presented “v6ops WG procedure”
  - a. XiPeng: good procedures for existing drafts, fully support. But charter also says we want to solicit input from operators and users. They may not have drafts. We should have a second session in every IETF, and invite operators to talk, or even invite IPv6-deniers to talk about IPv6 challenges, then we document the challenges and solve them
  - b. Ron: seems like a good idea

- c. XiPeng: v6ops is best place to do this. People may also talk about IPv6 challenges in IPv6 councils, NANOG. But after the talk, the challenges are not documented. If in v6ops, we can document the challenges and propose solutions, providing a single place of reference
- d. Warren: like the idea. We don't necessarily need a separate session each time, but should have time for invited talks or for discussing challenges
- e. Jared Mauch: IEPG meeting (Sunday) Operators show up and discuss issues. off IETF agenda. can be leveraged