

1.

Main differentiating features of:

4rd (a, b1, b2)

and

other 4via6 proposals

Table 1 - Port-set Algorithms

		Other s	4rd-a	4rd- b1	4rd- b2
A	Sharing ratios expressed by lengths of Port-set IDs	N	Y	Y	Y
B	Heuristic Friendliness to UPnP 1.0	Y/N	N	Y	N
C	Relative simplicity		+	=	++

Table 2 - CE Address format

	Features	Others	4rd-a	4rd-b1 and 4rd-b2
A	Direct CE-CE routes are POSSIBLE (no Per-CE state is REQUIRED)	Y/N	Y	Y
B	Independence of the IPv6 Routing plan from that of IPv4 IPv4 is POSSIBLE even with several IPv4 prefixes	Y/N Y only for dIVI-pd	Y	Y
C	Sizes of CE IPv4 spaces Sharing ratios (positive OR negative sharing ratios) CAN BE determined by lengths of CE IPv6 prefixes => Possibly no per-CE state	N	N (*)	Y
D	4via6 distinguishable of real IPv6	Y/N	N	Y

(*) Becomes a "Y" if A or B is an N

Table 3 - BR Address formats

Feature	Others	4rd-a a (*)	4rd-b1 and 4rd-b2
Direct CE-CE routes are POSSIBLE	Y/N	Y	Y

(*) Can become a "Y" if at least one of A and B becomes an N

2.

Main differentiating features of Double-translation and Encapsulation

	Feature	Double translation	Tunneling
A	Compatibility with EXISTING customer Management functions that may be needed between CEs and BRs	Y	N
B	Guarantee of IPv4 complete transparency, in particular for exclusive IPv4 addresses and prefixes	N	Y

Proposed conclusion:

Study more comparative importance of A and B.

Proposed conclusion:

Make the 4rd-addmapping draft a WG document
(with a clear separation between Port-set algorithm
and Address-format algorithms)