

IPv6 prefix assignment for end-customers - persistent vs non-persistent, and what size to choose.

(Best Current Operational Practice for operators)

What is this document all about?

- This document discusses the main issues related to the operational practices for the assignment of IPv6 prefixes for end-customers.
- Making wrong choices when designing your IPv6 network will sooner or later have negative implications on your deployment and require further effort such as renumbering when the network is already in operation. The temptation to take “easy” approaches for quicker deployment should therefore be resisted.

Co-authors

- Jan Žorž <zorz@isoc.org>,
- Sander Steffann <sander@steffann.nl>,
- Primož Dražumerič <Primoz.Drazumeric@telekom.si>,
- Mark Townsley <townsley@cisco.com>,
- Andrew Alston <andrew.alston@liquidtelecom.com>,
- Gert Doering <gert@space.net>,
- Jordi Palet <jordi.palet@consulintel.es>,
- Jen Linkova <furry@google.com>,
- Luis Balbinot <lbalbinot@brfibra.com.br>,
- Kevin Meynell <meynell@isoc.org>,
- Lee Howard <lee.howard@retevia.net>

Draft v.1

- <https://sinog.si/docs/draft-IPv6pd-BCOP-v1.pdf>
- [root@webserver]# grep draft-IPv6pd-BCOP-v1.pdf sinog-ssl_access_log* | wc -l

909

Draft v.2

- <https://sinog.si/docs/draft-IPv6pd-BCOP-v2.pdf>
- Number of comments and suggestions on-list and off-list...
- Presented and gathered some comments also at RIPE BCOP TF meeting on Monday
- Majority of co-authors, present at RIPE74 meeting in Budapest gathered in a lobby bar on Tuesday to do the editorial cycle, followed by language pass.
- Sent to RIPE IPv6 mailing list on 11th May at 02:44am

Editing draft v.2



Table of content:

1. Executive Summary

2. What is a BCOP?

3. Introduction and incentives

4. Size of end-customer prefix assignment: /48, /56 or something else?

4.1. Numbering the WAN link (interconnection between our network and the end-customer CPE):

4.1.1. /64 prefix out of a dedicated pool of IPv6 prefixes

4.1.2. Unnumbered

4.1.3. ULA

4.1.4. /64 prefix out of the IPv6 prefix assigned to the end-customer

4.1.5. Summary

4.2. Prefix assignment options

4.2.1. /48 for everybody

4.2.2. /48 for business customers and /56 for residential customers

4.2.3. Less than /56

4.2.4. Considerations for cellular operators

5. End-customer IPv6 prefix assignment: Persistent vs non-persistent

5.1. Why non-persistent assignments may be perceived as “easier” than static ones.

5.2. Why non-persistent assignments are considered harmful.

5.3. Why persistent prefix assignments are recommended.

6. Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Nathalie Kunneke-Trenaman, Mikael Abrahamsson, Jason Fesler, Martin Levy, Ian Dickinson, Philip Homburg, Ivan Pepelnjak, Matthias Kluth, Ondřej Caletka, Nick Hilliard, Paul Hoffman and Roman Nurul Islam for constructive criticism, suggestions and ideas how to make this document better. Special thanks go to RIPE IPv6 Working Group community and Chairs for accepting this document for technical review, and also the RIPE BCOP Task Force community and Chairs for ensuring it does conform with actual best operational practice.

Q&A

Suggestions?

Comments?

Ideas?

Way forward?