Motivations

• Documented the experiences from real world
• Summarize the NAT64 scenarios and share experiences / lessons
• Encourage IPv6-only discussions and Intend to help operators who may just start out planning NAT64 in the near future
  – RFC6136 reported at least 30% operators plan to run some kind of translator (presumably NAT64/DNS64)
• A good example is RFC6586; Link to it was suggested
  – This draft is more specific on NAT64 network planning
Comments & Potential Changes

• Seek a example of NAT64-CGN location and more descriptions about the justifications
  – NAT64-CGN is considered feature of the AS border
  – Allows consistent attribution and traceability within one service provider domain

• HA Considerations
  – Short-lived sessions account for most of the bindings
  – Data statistics have been shared on the list (question was been answered)

• The term of “CE” may lead the unnecessary confusion of equivalence of “CPE”
  – We intended to change the term as “NAT64-FE(Front End)”, which mostly indicates a traffic load balancer

• More revisions are needed so as to improve draft more concise and precise
Topics we covered: NAT64-CGN

• Positioning of NAT64-CGN
  – located NAT64-CGN to be close to IPv4 peers to reduce unnecessary backhaul costs and latency
• High Availability Consideration
  – cold-standby (VRRP); hot-standby (BIB sync)
• Traceability
  – Online (XFF, I-D.ietch-intarea-nat-reveal-analysis)
  – Offline (Syslog, Port allocation methods)
• Quality of Experience
  – ALG supporting for service richness
  – differentiated services
• Load Balance
  – I-D.zhang-behave-nat64-load-balancing
• MTU Consideration
  – Following I-D.ietch-6man-ipv6-atomic-fragments
Topics we covered: NAT64-FE

- Positioning of NAT64-FE
  - NAT64-FE(LB) suggestion is consistent with I-D.ietf-v6ops-icp-guidance (Section 7)
- Anti-DDoS/SYN Flood
  - L3 load balancer with capable of line rate DDOS defense
- User Behavior Analysis
  - Take a note that source address loss is unacceptable
- DNS Resolving
  - Follow RFC6144
- Load Balance
  - Collocated with load balancer
- MTU Consideration
  - Recommended configure IPv4 MTU>=1260
Status & Next Step

- Expecting more reviews from the group
- Trying to address all comments at next version and ask for WGLC
  - Any feedback?