

LSN and NAT444 Related documents

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/>

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/>

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr/>

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr/>

J.Yamaguchi (IIJ), A.Nakagawa (JPIX), H.Ashida (ITSCOM), I.Yamagata ,
Y.Shirasaki, T.Nishitani and S.Miyakawa (NTT Communications)

IETF78 @ Maastricht, Netherlands

2010 July

At a glance

- draft-nishitani-cgn
 - Talking about transparency
 - Today, we'd like to ask it for the WG item
- draft-shirasaki-nat444
 - Description of NAT444 model
 - Same as above
- draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr
 - Issues around address, routing and so on around NAT444 operation
 - May need more time
- draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr
 - Proposal of shared address space for NAT444
 - There are good works other than us and some of the people are asking us to join. It could be.

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/>

- Now this is separating from NAT444 description in <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/> and it's only aiming at transparency of IPv4 address sharing schemes such as NAT444 and others like DS-Lite, 6rd
- So the title is also changed to
“Common requirements for IP address sharing schemes”
- This draft is already on re-charter, and we hope forward as WG in this IETF.
 - like “draft-ietf-behave-ip-address-sharing-common-requirements” Or SO

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/> (cont')

- Getting some comments on and off line, now this draft lists each requirement with its status and justification. For example,
 - REQ-1: A NAT MUST have an "Endpoint-Independent Mapping" behavior.
 - Status: Same as REQ-1 in RFC4787
 - Justification: This is needed to use UNilateral Self-Address Fixing (UNSAF) which plays important role in STUN / TURN. More detailed description can be found in the original RFC. But to be more precise, in the LSN case, it may not be needed for some specific protocol such as DNS query and response.
- So, if any implementers and/or operators think that some of requirements are not applicable for them, this document now helps them to think about whether their decision can be appropriate or not much easier.

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/>
(cont')

- According to pre-meeting comments from Chairs, next version of text is going to be modified like :
 - any requirement that is unchanged from those original RFCs should not be repeated (nor reworded).
 - The draft should contain:
 - any additional requirements (e.g., to deal with inter-customer fairness)
 - any requirements that are changed (e.g., elevating a MAY to a SHOULD or MUST)
- But anyway, we'd like to change the name of this draft as WG item. Please allow us to do so.

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/>

- Now separated from original draft, this draft is just short description about what NAT444 model is
- Also we'd like to make this to WG item as a reference to NAT444 model as an Informational like “draft-ietf-behave-nat444” or so

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr/>

- This draft is also separated from original draft, it is dealing with issues like addressing and routing design relating to NAT444 model
- We could combine this with previous one or keep it separated because this could be needed to investigate a bit more to make previous document move faster

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr/>

- This draft is talking about the size of “ISP shared address”
- This time, we have not updated the text, just re-submit original text to prevent expiration
- <http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-azinger-additional-private-ipv4-space-issues.txt>
 - <http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/10mar/slides/opsawg-1.ppt> at OPSAWG

is a very good work and few other groups are now working on same subject. We'd like to know about feeling from the venue.

At the end

- Again, there are many NAT444 implementation from various vendors
- So, let us finish these works quickly as possible.
- Also, talking about ISP shared address issues, more groups than before are now identifying its importance. We are looking forward to see the opinions about this issues too.