SUBADDRESS AND PORT SCRAMBLING (SAPS) A approach to avoid NAT drawbacks in IPv6

IETF 73 - Minneapolis – 2008/11/21- Behave WG – Rémi Després

IETF-73 - 2008-11-20 - RD

Problem statement (1) NAT44 drawbacks

- **o** One point of failure
- Incoming connections made difficult
 - Port forwarding, STUN, TURN, UpNP, NAT-PMP etc.)
- E2E transparency is missing for:
 - Protocol independent call-backs and referrals
 - **.** Host controlled multi-homing (e.g. for SCTP)

Problem statement (2) NAT44 functions that can be useful in IPv6

- 1. Local addressing independence (Easy renumbering)
- 2. multi-homed CPEs
- 3. Incoming connection filtering
- 4. TOPOLOGY HIDING (invisibility of private routing plans)
- 5. HOST PRIVACY (no visible association of connections to individual hosts)

Are NATs needed in IPv6?

- Local addressing independence: Margaret's proposed 1:1 mapping
- Multihoming: SAMs ref. draft-despressam
- Incoming connection filtering: above IP (same in IPv4 and IPv6)
- TOPOLOGY HIDING AND HOST PRIVACY statelessly ? See next

Subaddress And Port Scrambling (SAPS)

- Scramble, at the customer edge, what you want to hide (multiply by a hidden key and place back in the same fields)
- If a local dynamic port is available (outgoing UDP, TCP etc.), then scramble subaddress, except IID type bit(s) and bits 2 to 15 of the port.
- Otherwise, just scramble the subaddress
- In incoming packets, unscramble

To be looked at

- How to scramble only for hosts that want privacy, letting others being identifiable
- In multihomed sites, how to distribute safely to the CPEs the same key (if needed)
- See whether the scrambling key can be changed without breaking all existing connections

To conclude: A QUESTION

What is best ?

- Saying IETF ENDORSES NAT66 (knowing that it will be taken as stateful as in NAT44)
- Saying that IETF DOES NOT ENDORSES NAT66, but ENDORSES NAC66 (or some other name), which is stateless

IMHO, needs further thought