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Starting with the Basics

CGN TECHNOLOGY
Address sharing needed when IPv6 is not available
Network Address Translation (NAT)
PAT and Address Overloading
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**Dual-Stack Lite**

**NAT Table**
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CGN builds NAT mapping using IPv6, IPv4, and port, then performs NAT.

CGN translates DA, adds IPv6 tunnel header, sends packet to HGW.

Modified DHCP Server
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Removes IPv6 header, forwards IPv4 packet to host.

Encapsulates packet with IPv6 header, sends it to CGN.
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## Typical Access Technology Transition Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity Type</th>
<th>IPv4</th>
<th>IPv6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>NAT444</td>
<td>6RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAT444</td>
<td>NAT444</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Evil in Necessary Evil

CGN CHALLENGES
CGN Testing Background

• CableLabs first conducted CGN testing in 2010
  o NAT444 only
• Second round June – Sep, 2011
  o Both NAT444 and DS-Lite
• Additional CGN testing in IPv6 interop events
  o About one a quarter
Overview of test scenarios

• Single and dual ISP networks with one or more users on multiple home networks

• Test applications include
  o Video services – e.g. Netflix, YouTube, iClips, Silverlight
  o Audio streaming – e.g. Pandora, Internet Archive
  o Peer-to-peer – e.g. on line gaming, uTorrent
  o FTP – large file transfers
  o SIP calls – e.g. X-Lite, Skype
  o Video chat – e.g. Skype, OoVoo
  o Social networking – e.g. Facebook, Webkinz
  o Web conferencing – e.g. GoToMeeting
Client devices and gateways used for testing

- Laptops running Vista, Win 7 and MAC OS
- Gaming consoles
- Tablet devices
- iPhone and Android smartphones
- CE devices
  - Blu Ray players, Smart TVs
- CPE routers
  - Most vendors represented
Observations

• The following types of applications behaved erratically or had the potential to break:
  o Video streaming, e.g. Netflix, YouTube
  o Peer-to-peer, e.g. uTorrent, Bittorent, Limewire
  o On line gaming, e.g. X-box
  o FTP file transfer

• Performance dependent on home gateway
  o Different NAT types (full cone, partial cone) perform differently

• Observed behaviors were exacerbated when multiple users or multiple home networks were involved

• User experience further degraded when crossing ISPs and when “hairpinning” through the same CGN
Log volumes

150 - 450 bytes/connection
* 33k - 216k connections per sub per day

5 - 96 MB / user / day

That’s potentially over 1 PB per 1M subs per month
It’s also over 20Mbps for just the log stream…
CGN Challenges

• Poor quality of experience for advanced services
  o Peer-to-peer, video streaming, gaming, etc.

• Negative impact to targeted advertising/geo-location

• Logging requirements for lawful intercept
  o Petabytes of data
## Workarounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Workarounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2P SIP (cannot initiate/ receive calls)</td>
<td>Use Proxies for Peer to Peer applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uTorrent (seeding does not work)</td>
<td>Port Control Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2P Gaming</td>
<td>Software Upgrade from Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Control Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraded experience for services such as Netflix, video streaming</td>
<td>Deploy tested home-routers from an approved list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower Download rates (some clients)</td>
<td>No known workarounds (Try larger MTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact to targeted advertising/geo-location</td>
<td>Distributed CGN, Regional IP and Port assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging requirements for lawful intercept</td>
<td>Deterministic NAT, Data compression, Bulk port assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlapping Addressing / NAT Zones</td>
<td>Large enough shared transition space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to traffic engineering</td>
<td>Distributed CGN, VRF (MPLS/VPN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Port Control Protocol (PCP)

- **PCP is an IETF protocol**
  - Expected to be an RFC soon
  - Allows an IPv6 or IPv4 host/router to control how incoming IPv6 or IPv4 packets are translated and forwarded by a network address translator (NAT) or simple firewall
  - PCP can solve a number problems identified with CGN

- **Challenges**
  - Requires CPE Router and CGN support
  - Requires that trust boundary be extended to subscriber for port assignment
Summary

- Significant improvement year over year
  - CGN improvements
  - Content provider updates (X-Box live, Netflix)
  - Application updates (X-Lite, uTorrent)
- CGN experience not as good as un-NATed IPv4
  - Degradations in P2P, streaming applications
- DS-Lite and NAT444 perform similarly
  - Additional impacts to hairpinned DS-Lite connections
- Troubleshooting issues will be difficult

- More: draft-donley-nat444-impacts
Looking for Answers

CGN ARCHITECTURES
Architectural Constraints

- Relative deployment cost (day 1 cost)
  - Ease of implementation
- Impact on routing: Changes required in current routing infrastructure
  - Traffic Engineering: Allows MSO to distribute/route traffic
  - Load Balancing: Sharing load between different devices
- Scalability: Response to increased traffic/subscriber growth
- Subscriber IP addressing
  - Size of Private Subnet needed
  - Number of Public Addresses used
- Geo-location: Granularity of geolocation information obtained
- On-net server deployment: Ease of placement of various servers
Architecture – Centralized
Architecture - Distributed
Architecture – Hybrid (Phased approach)
Recommendation

• A phased hybrid approach is recommended
  o Start with Regionalized CGNs
  o Add CGNs as needed locally as the CGN user base grows

• Rationale
  o Offers ISPs easy starting point and wide reach
  o Low impact to routing and traffic engineering
  o Offers the most flexible scalability over time
Further Considerations

- Subscriber differentiation
- Routing CGN Traffic
- Redundancy
- Load balancing & Scalability
- Server location & NAT bypass
- IP Addressing
- Geo location
- Logging
- Security
- Address Reputation
NAT Bypass and Server Location

• Goal: Optimizing local traffic and subscriber access to advanced services

• Server Location (in a NAT444 environment)
  o Any internal (e.g. voice, video) or 3rd party (e.g. CDN) application servers that are placed inside the CGN should offer better performance
  o This is less important for basic services such as web and email

• NAT444 CGN Bypass
  o Don’t send traffic through the CGN unnecessarily
  o Use native dynamic routing to reach servers inside the CGN
  o Add servers to CGN VPN, if in use

• DS-Lite: Enable IPv6 on all servers (all IPv4 goes through CGN)
IP Addressing: Public “outside” addressing

- Number of addresses required determined by number of CGN subscribers and compression algorithm
  - Start low; ~8x
- Where to get addresses?
  - Re-purposing existing addresses
    - Renumber infrastructure to IPv6 or private IPv4
    - Renumber customers to inside CGN addresses
  - Acquire new addresses – transfer market?
  - Reserve addresses now
  - Does not need to be contiguous space
- Port restrictions
  - Should not be an issue at low compression ratios
IP Addressing: Inside Addressing

• NAT444: Use a single network-wide pool of inside addresses
  ○ 100.64.0.0/10 Shared Transition Space
  ○ Assign local (per site) blocks out of larger pool for operational clarity, logging, the ability to insert local CGNs, and potential geo-location benefits

• DS-Lite: Any addresses are acceptable and can be reused per tunnel
Geolocation

- Local (per-site) CGNs will offer roughly equal granularity to what is available today
- Regional CGNs will dilute geo-location data
- One idea to minimize this dilution is to use separate outside pools of addresses which correspond to the per-site private subnets
  - These public pools should be loose, to borrow from the next pool if needed
    - Either borrow from an adjacent pool, or higher level pool

Per headend private subnets carved from inside CGN space

Public subnets carved from outside CGN space

Public subnets use SWIP and RDNS to identify their particular headend
Log Reduction Strategies

• Port block reservations
  o Reduce logging up to 100x

• Log compression
  o Reduces volume, but not search time

• Deterministic reservation
  o See next slide…
Proposal: Deterministic Port Reservation

- **draft-donley-behave-deterministic-cgn**
- Collect inside range, outside range, compression ratio
  - Compression ratio ≥ inside/outside
  - Inside range/compression ratio = ports/user
  - Set aside well-known ports (<1024) & dynamic overflow range
  - Pre-reserve port ranges for each internal IP address
  - Allow dynamic reservation above that threshold
    - Remote logging only required for dynamic reservations
    - Still need state logging locally for every active connection

- Limitations:
  - Requires low compression ratios
  - Requires configuration change control process
Deterministic NAT Illustrated

DHCP

Reserved Port (e.g. 80)

CGN Device

CGN Mapping Table

Subscriber 1 (DHCP STP Address 1)

Subscriber 2 (DHCP STP Address 2)

Subscriber 3 (DHCP STP Address 3)

Subscriber 4 (DHCP STP Address 4)

IP 1, Port Pool 1

IP 1, Port Pool 2

IP 1, Port Pool 3

IP 1, Port Pool 4

IP 1 Reserved Pool

IP 1 Reserved Pool

IP 1 Bulk Pool

Static, PCP, portal, etc.

Pool exhausted

Logging Required

DHCP Logging Required

Dynamic, PCP, portal, etc.
Security Considerations

• CGN Inside IP Space Filtering:
  o Block CGN routes from being advertised to and from peers
  o Block traffic with CGN source or destination IPs at borders
  o This filtering likely does not happen on the CGN device

• DOS Mitigation at the CGN:
  o CGN device becomes target for DOS and other IP-focused attacks from outside your network
  o CGN device is also bottleneck for attacks sourced from CGN subscriber networks
IP Address Reputation

• IP blacklisting is more problematic with multiple subscribers behind a single outside IP
  o All subs behind that IP are affected
  o Any sub behind that IP can cause the listing

• Examples:
  o Secure transactions (Banking, Storefronts, etc.)
  o Email spam lists (Spamhaus, etc.)
  o Individual website blocking (comment spam, etc.)

• Difficult to troubleshoot
  o Requires CGN logging
The Big Picture and What’s Next

CONCLUSIONS
IPv6 Offers a Better Experience than Shared IPv4

IPv4 traffic passes through ISP NAT, resulting in a diminished experience. IPv6 traffic goes directly to the Internet, offering a better experience.

IPv6 Internet

ISP NAT Device

IPv4 Internet

Dual-Stack IPv4/IPv6 Network

All IPv6 traffic (normal)

Web, email (normal)

IPv4/IPv6 Remote Device

P2P (dropped)

Video streaming (degraded)

IPv4/IPv6 Customer Device (e.g. PC, TV)

Dual-Stack IPv4/IPv6 (IPv4 & IPv6)

Home Router (IPv4 & IPv6)

Requires **Dual-Stack (IPv4 & IPv6)** PC and Home Gateway
We still have a lot of work to do!

IPv4 Exhaustion

Experience Gap

IPv6 experience will improve as ecosystem adds support

Address sharing will affect subscriber IPv4 experience

Quality of Experience

IPv4
IPv6

Time

Now
In Short

• IPv6 is the answer to IPv4 address exhaustion
• CGN can support legacy IPv4 systems for some time
• Deploying CGN **will** impact your customers
  o P2P, VoIP, gaming, video, streaming & geolocation, etc.
  o For many, a necessary evil to maintain IPv4 service
• A properly designed architecture can help
  o Optimize routing, latency and jitter
  o Reduce logging requirements
  o Improve targeted advertising results
  o Mitigate the impact on your customers
Questions?

Chris Grundemann

c.grundemann@cablelabs.com
http://chrisgrundemann.com