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Timeline of events @AS6799

- IPv6-wg initial Research (May 2013)
- LW4o6 RFC Published (Jul 2015)
- PoC (Jan – Mar 2016)
- Vendor Selection (Aug 2016)
- Trial@Prod BNG (Jun 2017)
- Feasibility Study (Sep 2014)
- lwAFTR RFQ (DT) Start (Sep 2015)
- 1st CPE f/w (Feb 2016)
- Pilot@Paiania (Mar 2017)
- 100k target (May 2018)
Public IPv4 Exhaustion was and still is the main driver

- Around 2012 RIRs really started worrying about the imminent exhaustion

- RIPE began allocation from its last /8 around September 2012

- At the time, ~500k addresses were available from OTE’s public IPv4 pool
Public IPv4 Exhaustion was and still is the main driver

- OTE started researching possible transition techniques on May 2013, as part of the (now defunct) IPv6 Working Group
- These included:
  - DS-Lite
  - NAT64
  - 6rd
  - XLAT464
  - MAP-(E/T)
  - Lightweight 4over6
Public IPv4 Exhaustion – IPv6-only feasibility

Feasibility Study

– Around September 2014, OTE’s public pool was running low (~150k addresses left)
– A feasibility study was produced
– Main proposal was to move forward with an IPv6-only residential service, as a mitigation
– IPv4 was to be treated as a service over the IPv6 network
– If time became of essence, a temporary CGN (NAT444) solution was to be deployed
IPv6-only Service (desired) Main Characteristics

- IPv4 as a service (IPv4aaS) carried over the IPv6 network
- Stateless
- Distributed
- Flexible
- Possibility to completely remove IPv4 in the future
- Minimize Logging (data retention)
- Virtualized (scalability of functions)
- SIMPLE design

MAP and LW4o6 were the main contenders
LW4o6 chosen as part of DT focus (Terrastream architecture)
LW4o6 Overview

- rfc7596 - Extension to DS-Lite
- Moves the Network Address and Port Translation (NAPT) function from the (centralized) AFTR to the tunnel client lwB4 (function on the CPE)
- Provisioning of necessary parameters to CPEs via DHCPv6
- Stateless nature of lwAFTR
- Encapsulation/decapsulation via a mapping table (shared IPv4 address, port range, lwB4 tunnel endpoint)
- All IPv6 traffic follows the existing native path
• Main components: IwAFTR, IwB4
• Only Encap/Decap performed at IwAFTR, based on binding table rules
Lw4o6 Overview (cont.)

• Main components: lwAFTR, lwB4
• Only Encap/Decap performed at lwAFTR, based on binding table rules
Main components: lwAFTR, lwB4

Only Encap/Decap performed at lwAFTR, based on binding table rules
Lw4o6 Overview (cont.)

- Main components: LwAFTR, LwB4
- Only Encap/Decap performed at LwAFTR, based on binding table rules
**Main components:** LwAFTR, LwB4

- Only Encap/Decap performed at LwAFTR, based on binding table rules.
Lw4o6 Overview - Provisioning

Binding Table @AFTR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPv6 address for a single lwB4</th>
<th>Public IPv4 address</th>
<th>Restricted port set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a02::707:707:1</td>
<td>7.7.7.7</td>
<td>1024-2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPv6 Delegated Prefix (/56)

IPv4

No algorithmic relationship

• No algorithmic relationship between IPv4 and IPv6 – greater flexibility
• Much simpler from a planning/implementation perspective
• Harder provisioning ;-(

Lw4o6 @AS6799
CPE (lwB4 function)

• CPE part (as well as provisioning) was excluded from the RFQ process
• LW4o6 support (lwB4 function) had to be implemented
  – Tunnel endpoint
  – Support for (new) DHCPv6 options
• Development was done for a single target CPE
• lwB4 function and LW4o6 support in general, is now mandatory for all (future) company/group CPEs
RFQ Process

• Deliverable: *a lwAFTR VNF running on COTS H/W that could accommodate multi-10Gbps traffic with predictable performance*

• 4 Vendors participated

• No solutions were mature, development was done in parallel with the RFQ mostly

• All solutions were tested in OTE labs

• After more than a year, a single vendor was selected
Snabb

- Snabb (formerly "Snabb Switch") is a simple and fast packet networking toolkit.
- With Snabb you can implement networking applications using the Lua(JIT) language.
- Open Source project, creator Luke Gorrie (has an affiliation with DT (consultant at Terrastream project)
- Ethernet I/O with no kernel overhead ("kernel bypass" mode). Also called user-mode networking
- Can create data-plane applications achieving line rate performance on 10G and beyond
IwAFTR VNF (Snabb+Juniper) – High Level

Encapsulation/decapsulation performed
Separate Snabb process per physical NIC
Separate VM for control plane functions (mgmt, routing etc)
Separate VM for forwarding plane

Packaged as a docker container
lw4o6 deployment - components

- CPE support (focused on a single model, the one with the highest user penetration)
- BNG configuration (for DHCPv6 proxy)
- RADIUS configuration per user
- Central DHCPv6 in DC locations (2 locations in Athens)
- lwAFTR in DC locations (2 locations in Athens)
- Monitoring / measurements
- Provisioning / automation scripts
BNG

- Cisco equipment
- Target 2 specific IOS-XR versions (current and future deployment)
- Communicated and requested missing / desired DHCPv6 features to vendor
- DHCPv6 server or proxy functionality per PPP class of users, end-user identification in DHCPv6 messages

[Interface-Id (option 18, rfc 3315), Relay Agent Remote-ID (option 37, rfc 4649), Relay Agent Subscriber-ID (option 38, rfc 4580) and Client Link-Layer Address (Option 79, rfc 6939)]
RADIUS

- FreeRADIUS setup with custom config
- Introduced a new RADIUS profile 'lw4o6'
- The profile disables IPv4 during PPP and instructs DHCPv6 on BNG
- Selected users during the provisioning procedure get the profile in their LDAP entry
- A disconnection is required for the new profile to be activated
DHCPv6

- lw4o6 provisioning on the CPE happens over DHCPv6
- DHCPv6 options provide the tunnel endpoint (S46_BR), the public IPv4, tunnel source prefix (S46_V4V6BIND) and port range (S46_PORTPARAMS) all encapsulated in S46_CONT_LW (96)
- BNG acts as DHCPv6 server in the dual stack case, does not support lw4o6 options
- A central DHCPv6 server was introduced for lw4o6 support
- ISC dhcpd initially with 'binary' config generated via script
- High availability using 2 servers in each location
lw4o6 DC location - schema
Service provisioning

- Initial service deployment in a few BNGs
- Custom developed scripts
- Target users activated in batches
- TR069 platform provides an initial report of users with correct CPE
- A script selects a batch (various criteria applied)
- For each user in batch CPE TR069 URL is changed, RADIUS profile activated in LDAP and a PPP disconnection is performed
- Provisioning occurs outside "official" IT flows
Automation

- LwAFTR binding table and DHCPv6 configuration need to match
- Developed scripts to automate the process of configuration generation
- Binding table upload and commit in LwAFTRs is automated as well
- Web interface provided to help desk to revert user in the original dual stack setup in case of problems
Monitoring / measurements

- Utilized open source open-nti from Juniper for lwAFTRs, contributed patches upstream
- Contains multiple open source components in a docker container (InfluxDB, Grafana, …)
- Added few extra stuff in our nagios infrastructure
- A migration of the extra stuff (DHCPv6 mostly) is underway to a next-gen setup (grafana, prometheus)
Measurements (schema)

- 12 BNGs in production, ~18500 lw4o6 users, 2 DC locations
<HUMOR>

Problems?
</HUMOR>
Challenges

- Users with services over IPv4 (e.g. IP cameras) [expected]
- CPE dragons
- Selected and not global BNG service deployment causes issues (e.g. user dslam port migration)
- Unknown scalability of current ISC dhcpd deployment
- lwAFTR issues @live traffic [mitigated]
- No possibility for a 'static' IPv6 offering in current setup
- Higher risk due to a forced change to a central DHCPv6 server for all users of the target BNG [old IOS-XR]
Operational Experiences

- CPE Issues (e.g. VoIP, DHCPv6, ...)
- (IPv4) address sharing issues
- Fragmentation / MTU [no noticeable issues]
- No dependency between IPv4-IPv6 addressing (but planning ahead recommended)

- **Flexibility** in routing
  - *anycast* IPv6 AFTR endpoint
  - IPv4 (public ranges)

- Can easily add extra capacity (VNF on-a-stick lwAFTR)
Future work

- Lighten / offload current CGN setup
- Move all BNGs to new IOS-XR version
- Evaluation of ISC Kea for a scalable central DHCPv6 server to overcome current issues with the DHCPv6 infrastructure
- Expand deployment with more users / BNGs
- Improve service provisioning [most work done]
- Promote deployment on international fora / collaborate with other operators
Future work (contd)

- Different classes of service (groups with different port ranges)
- Expose Port range to end users (facilitate port-fwding)
- Provisioning via RADIUS (draft-ietf-softwire-map-radius)
- Configuration/Operation via YANG (draft-ietf-softwire-yang)
- Support Unified IPv4-in-IPv6 CPE (rfc8026)
Questions?
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