NAT64 Operational Experiences

draft-ietf-v6ops-nat64-experience-04

IETF 88- Vancouver, Nov 2013

Gang Chen                     China Mobile
Zhen Cao                      China Mobile
Chongfeng Xie                 China Telecom
David Binet                   France Telecom
Comments from IETF#86

• Add ULA considerations
• Add the description of bulk port allocation
• Add the experience using IPv4 pool subdivision method
• Some editorial changes from reviewers
Updates (1/2)

• ULAs considerations
  – ULAs can’t work with NAT64-CGN,
    • The host with an IPv6-only connection will use NAT64 when IPv4 only server is targeted
    • The host with dual-stack connections will never prefer ULA over IPv4, so NAT64-CGN will never be used
    • It may be considered to make changes to host behavior, but it involves significant costs
  – ULAs can’t work with NAT64-FE,
    • It requires hosts across the Internet to connect with NAT64
Updates(2/2)

• Polish the statement of log traceability
  – Dynamic port allocation requires per-session log
  – Bulk port allocation requires per-subscriber log
  – Deterministic allocation doesn’t require log

• Add the description of IPv4 address pool subdivision method to translate IPv6 address depending on the geographic location
New Comments

• Clarify the case when NAT64 serves as the IPv6 gateway (Sec. 3.1.2)

```
IPv6  NAT64  dual-stack Server  IPv4 Server
     IPv4
```

It’s recommended the WAN interface should be configured with both IPv4 and IPv6 connections

• Polish the statement of NAT44 & NAT64 co-existing (Sec. 3.1.4)

• Clarify that the sub-domain configuration is only for the experimental phase (Sec 3.2)

• Share the data for the scale of sync data in hot standby (Sec 4.1)

• Add the discussion when XFF header is incompatible with log server or log parsing tools (Sec. 5.2)

• Assessing the Impact of NAT64 to applications (Sec. 6.1)
Next Step

• Incorporate all comments in next version

• Get the WG consensus to move on

• Comments?