NAT444 Related documents

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr/
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr/

J.Yamaguchi (IIJ), A.Nakagawa (KDDI), H.Ashida (ITSCOM), I.Yamagata ,
Y.Shirasaki, T.Nishitani and S.Miyakawa (NTT Communications)

IETF77 @ Anaheim, CA

2010 March

At a glance

- draft-nishitani-cgn
  - Talking about transparency
  - Hope move quickly forward as WG item
- draft-shirasaki-nat444
  - Description of NAT444 model
  - Same as above
- draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr
  - Issues around address, routing and so on around NAT444 operation
  - May need more time
- draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr
  - Proposal of shared address space for NAT444
  - There are good works other than us, we're going to stop our work to propose another (private) IPv4 address space here in IETF

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/

- Now this is separating from NAT444 description in https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/ and it's only aiming at transparency of IPv4 address sharing schemes such as NAT444 and others like DS-Lite, A+P

- So the title is also changed to

  "Common requirements for IP address sharing schemes"

- As BEHAVE re-charter goes well, we'd like to contribute to make this as one of the working group items as an Informational or BCP RFC and change the name like

- "draft-behave-ip-address-shareing-common-requirements.txt" or so

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-nishitani-cgn/ (cont')

- Getting some comments on and off line, now this draft lists each requirement with its status and justification. For example,
  - UDP-REQ-1: A NAT MUST have an "Endpoint-Independent Mapping" behavior.
  - Status: Same as REQ-1 in RFC4787
  - Justification: This is needed to use UNilateral Self-Address Fixing (UNSAF) which plays important role in STUN / TURN. More detailed description can be found in the original RFC. But to be more precise, in the LSN case, it may not be needed for some specific protocol such as DNS query and response.

- So, if any implementers and/or operators think that some of requirements are not applicable for them, this document now helps them to think about whether their decision can be appropriate or not much easier.

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-nat444/

- Now separated from original draft, this draft is just short description about what NAT444 model is
- Also we'd like to make this to WG item as a reference to NAT444 model as an Informational like "draft-behave-nat444.txt" or so

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/ draft-shirasaki-nat444-isp-shared-addr/

- This draft is also separated from original draft, it is dealing with issues like addressing and routing design relating to NAT444 model

- We could combine this with previous one or keep it separated because this could be needed to investigate a bit more to make previous document move faster

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shirasaki-isp-shared-addr/

- This draft is talking about the size of "ISP shared address"

- This time, we have not updated the text, just re-submit original text to prevent expiration

- http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-azinger-additional-private-ipv4-space-issues-03.txt

  - http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/10mar/slides/opsawg-1.ppt at OPSAWG

  is a very good work and we might not need to discuss about ours here in IETF

At last

- Today several vendors have started shipping NAT444 devices

- As far as we know, many (or all) of them are following our original requirement draft(s)

- We strongly believe that we have to have standard documents describing NAT444 as quick as possible to let communities share the ideas including pros and cons and the BEAHVE WG is the most appropriate place to achieve it