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Session 1, Monday

9:00  Note takers, agenda, existing milestones  (Chairs, 10)

9:10  Framework  (Fred Baker, 20)
draft-ietf-behave-v6v4-framework-00

9:30  Translation  (Xing Li, 20)
draft-ietf-behave-v6v4-xlate-00

9:50  Stateful Translation  (Marcelo Bagnulo Braun, 20)
draft-ietf-behave-v6v4-xlate-stateful-01

10:10 IPv6 Addressing of IPv6/IPv4 Translators  (Dave Thaler, 20)
draft-thaler-behave-translator-addressing-00

10:30 Affect of IPv6 Prefix with Referrals  (Xing Li, 15)
draft-bcx-behave-learn-address-00

10:45 Learning the IPv6 Prefixes of an IPv6/IPv4 Translator  (Dan Wing, 15)
draft-wing-behave-learn-prefix-03

11:00 Translation in Host  (Hui Deng, 15)
draft-huang-pnat-host-ipv6-01 proposal

11:15 ICMPv6 Echo Replies for Teredo Clients  (Teemu Savolainen, 15)
draft-denis-icmpv6-generation-for-teredo-00

11:30 end
Session 2, Tuesday

9:00 Agenda, note takers

9:05 DNS64
draft-ietf-behave-dns64-00

9:25 DNS64 implementation report

9:35 FTP64
draft-van-beijnum-behave-ftp64-05

9:55 Virtual IPv6 Connectivity for IPv4-Only Networks
draft-vogt-durand-virtual-ip6-connectivity-02

10:10 Multicast IPv6/IPv4 Translation Framework
draft-venaas-behave-v4v6mc-framework-00

10:30 Common Functions of Large Scale NAT (LSN)
draft-nishitani-cgn-02

10:45 Redundancy and Load Balancing for Stateful NAT
draft-xu-behave-stateful-nat-standby-00

11:00 BGP for load balancing NAT
draft-chen-behave-rsnat-01

11:05 Generic Referral Object (GRO)
draft-carpenter-behave-referral-object-00

11:20 NAT Control Protocols Review
draft-brockners-nat-control-protocols-review-00

11:25 finished
Note Well
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Revised Charter

• Added two new Scenarios:
  – 5. An IPv6 network to an IPv4 network
  – 6. An IPv4 network to an IPv6 network
Existing Milestones

• December 2008
  – SCTP – has anyone reviewed?
  – TURN (on track; date slipped)

• Mar 2009:
  – TURN-TCP
  – TURN-v6
  – Create milestones for 6/4 translation scenarios

• Editor’s queue:
  – NAT-ICMP

• IESG Processing:
  – Behavior-discovery, TURN
Documents ready for WGLC

- draft-ietf-behave-turn-uri-02
- draft-ietf-behave-turn-tcp-04
- draft-ietf-behave-sctpnat-01
# New Milestone Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Submit standards-track relay protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Determine relative prioritization of the four translation cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Determine what solutions(s) and components are needed to solve each of the four cases. Create new milestones for the solution(s) and the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2009</td>
<td>Submit BCP document for SCTP NAT behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2009</td>
<td>Submit standard-track document of an IPv6 relay protocol to IESG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track TURN-URI document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track document for relaying of a TCP bytestream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Submit informational for framework for IPv6/IPv4 translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track stateless IPv6/IPv4 translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track stateful IPv6/IPv4 translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track DNS rewriting for IPv6/IPv4 translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
<td>Submit standards-track FTP ALG for IPv6/IPv4 translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>Submit BCP large scale NAT requirements document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** Are some of these too aggressive?