

I-D.anderson-v6ops-v4v6-xlat-prefix

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?

