v6ops Working Group
Meeting Date / Time 2025-07-21 17:00 - 19:00 Europe / Madrid
Room: El Prado

Chairs: Ron Bonica, Nick Buraglio, XiPeng Xiao

Minute taker: Paolo Volpato
Jabber Scribe: TBD

Chair's opening - Note Well & WG status, Ron Bonica, Nick Buraglio, Xipeng Xiao, 10 minutes
Tribute to Fred Baker.
Number of RFCs stable, drop in attendance.

Jen: check general attendance of the corresponding IETF to see if there is similar fluctuation. Second, how many people here scanned QR code? Some may not.
Tim: clarify what you meant by "Work with HAPPY WG to define HEv3 logs when IPv6 not selected"
Warren: IETF network is IPv6-mostly
Jordi: to collaborate with Happy WG. Years ago it was reported here the result of happy eyeballs. Now the work should move to Happy WG.

WG Drafts

464XLAT Customer-side Translator (CLAT): Node Recommendations, Jen Linkova/Tommy Jensen, 10m
Chairs polled the room and there is clear consensus for WGLC

Using Dummy IPv4 Address and Node Identification Extensions for IP/ICMP translators (XLATs) , Jen Linkova / David Lamparter, 10m
Warren: why haven't noted it moved?
Poll pushed. Consensus shown by audience for WGLC.

7084bis, Ben Patton, 15m
Bob: Looked at the draft. One of your changes is on current version of node P6 requirement. It's old node requirements. Probably soon to move ahead. More RFCs to look at.
Ted: PD on LAN should be a must.
Lorenzo: LAN Pd should be everywhere, some boxes don't have it. Bugs still present in RAs. not sure if this document can make a statement, otherwise think of 6man.
Timothy: Several RFCs available. E.g. 7084 P on LAN, agree with Ted, but feel most of home gateways don't do that.
OndreJ: we should say what the devices do. We need to say what we want.
timothy: surprised that people has to say the must do.
Ondrej: pool for PD on LAN should be appropriate.
Jordi: we must have a must. If broken because of ISPs, this is different. Let's say them broken

because of them.
Warren:
Lorenzo: if it's must, people will do but you have to be careful. Things must be very clear.
Bob: I'd like to see Hop by hop processing, so don't drop.
Tommy: we must have a should.
Ted: the implementation has to be followed.

Active Individual Drafts

Filtering address records in stub resolvers, Ondřej Caletka, 10m
Jen: draft overlaps with Happy eyeballs that explicitly defines queries. This draft may focus on what connectivity over protocol version X means.
Ondrej: yes there is overlap but not everybody implements it.
jen: make sure there is no contradiction between the two documents.
Lorenzo: How to get out of it. Difficult to implement it. Also may bring to broken configurations.
Ondrej: yes, but some addresses are more stable.
Nick: run into the problem with VPN clients. this is a problem space to be addressed.
Tommy: part of the performance is that it's multimessage query.
Show of hands highlights interest for adoption.

Reclassifying NAT64 (RFC6146) and a few other docs to STD, Jordi Palet Martinez, 10m
Bob: errata have to be addressed
Jen: question about the process. 7915 may reference to 6145.
Philipp: to my knowledge there is only one format ever used.
Jordi: it's one with /96.
Ron: why move to move to -bis?
Jordi: some of the RFC are not standrads.
Ron: very little difference between proposed and full standards.
jen: need to know the differences between the two.
Warren: I don't know what is a full standard.
Bob: a new clean document that a reader can read.
Jordi: the state change is done by IESG.
Ron: good thing to clean the errata, different is to move to full standard.
Jordi: let's take the discussion on a one by one basis.

Discussion (as time allows)

Default Address Selection and multiple routers on a single link hackathon result, Jen Linkova and David Lamparter, 15m
Lorenzo: the problem is Linux won't allow to configure two default routes on the same interface. When we tried it years ago, rule 5.5 didn't work. it's hard to keep it correct if you don't have source tests. Corner cases may exit despite the use cases discussed.
Considerations of Gradual IPv6-only Deployment in 5G Mobile Networks, Chenhao Ma, 10m

Jen: Glad to hear mobile operators are interested in PREF64. Are you working on the standards?
Chenhao: Yes.

Basic Requirements for IPv6-only Provider Edge Routers, Cong Li, 10m
Tom: draft designed to talk about a generic topic, while you have been very specific with some of the suggestions like SRv6 which is only one of the available options. Suggest rewrite on generic methods to avoid being very specific to IPv6-only PEs
Jen: second Tom's statement.
Ron: methodology issue with requirements. Difference between what an operator wants and another that doen't want.

A Survey of the Current State of CLAT Availability and Performance on Non-Mobile Systems, Nick Buraglio, 10m
Jen: How do you see this document to progress? is it a draft that progresses adopted by IESG or you keep it updated?
Nick: do not have strong opinion. We don't need it to progress further. May even not be a draft.
Xipeng: find it useful because CLAT widely deployed in mobile. Should be also in fixed as well. Currently too many options.
Nick: all major OSes do support CLAT.
Xipeng: residential gateways may not use a major OS.
Tommy: WGs have used wiki to put this information. Useful, keep it updated.
Jen: it's a wiki information.
Chongfeng: interested in this work.
nick: please contribute with papers.
Gabor: wikipedia does not allow publications.