Tore Anderson
Redpill Linpro AS
IETF 96, Berlin, July 2016
This I-D designates all of 64::/16 for locally significant use with IPv4/IPv6 translation

- Imagine you're an operator who would normally prefer to use RFC6052's WKP 64:ff9b::/96, but can't because...
  - You have more than one instance of NAT64/IVI/SIIT/SIIT-DC/etc. in your network (only one of them can use the WKP), or
  - You can't live with RFC6052 section 3.1's restrictions, in particular the one that forbids use of the WKP with non-global (RFC1918) IPv4 addresses, or
  - You need to use a shorter prefix than /96 (note: in addition to /96, RFC6052 section 2.2 specifies /32, /40, /48, /56 and /64), or
  - You want to use some other address mapping scheme that's incompatible with/different from RFC6052 (something homegrown, RFC6219 section 3.1, some future IETF IPv4/IPv6 translation technology, or whatever)

- This I-D would allow you to use 64::/96 for your (second?) NAT64 instance, 64:6219:ff00:/40 for your IVI deployment, and so on.
Relation to RFC6052's WKP 64:ff9b::/96

• RFC6052's rules are left as-is: «64:ff9b::/96 may only be used according to [RFC6052]»

• Suggestion from David Farmer: Reserve all of 64:ff00::/24 for designation as WKPs in current and future IETF IPv4/IPv6 translation standards

• This would encompass the already existing 64:ff9b::/96 WKP

• Question for the WG: Is this a good idea? (I think so.)
Next steps

- Improve IANA consideration sections with the exact values to go in the IANA special use registry (thanks, David Farmer)
- Add *Updates: RFC6890* (thanks, Fred Baker)
- *Question for the WG:* Adopt as working group doc?
- Any other questions or comments?