

IETF LIM
Amsterdam, The
Netherlands

Enterprise Incremental IPv6

draft-ietf-v6ops-enterprise-incremental-ipv6

K. Chittimaneni, T. Chown, L. Howard, V. Kuarsingh, Y. Pouffary, E. Vyncke

Updates

- Document accepted as WG item
 - <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-v6ops-enterprise-incremental-ipv6-01>
- Changed name to “Enterprise IPv6 Deployment Guidelines”
- Addressed some comments from list
- Updated references
- 3.4.3 Specific Security Issues for IPv6
 - Clarified that the use of Privacy extension addresses requires the additional monitoring and logging
 - Added reference to draft-ietf-opsec-v6-00
- 5.1 Network Infrastructure
 - Made it explicit that OSPFv2 and v3 are not the same
 - Added reference to draft-matthews-v6ops-design-guidelines

Mailing List Comments (1/2)

- Clarify that whether or not the ISP may provide native IPv6 services has no bearing on whether the enterprise should also provide native IPv6 services
- Add a statement that states that many of the reasons given in this section are new since the publication of RFC1687 and do give good reasons for transition
- Add citation to reflect ease and speed of merging IPv6 networks
- Elaborate on the PI/PA recommendations
- Consolidate security and routing section
- Move 3.6 “Program Planning” to be up on the top as 3.1
- Elaborate on operational costs vs. needs
- Clarify recommendations on tunneling vs. translation vs. native and elaborate on where each makes sense

Mailing List Comments (2/2)

- Add reference to RFC6724, RFC 6177, RFC 5375
- Describe the issues and the importance of ICMP/pMTUd as it pertains to MTU settings
- Add some text to cover NAT66

Next Steps

- Next pass to fill in rest of gaps
- Get feedback on updated draft

Q&A

THANK YOU!