
Stream: Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
RFC: [8781](#)
Category: Standards Track
Published: April 2020
ISSN: 2070-1721
Authors: L. Colitti J. Linkova
Google Google

RFC 8781

Discovering PREF64 in Router Advertisements

Abstract

This document specifies a Neighbor Discovery option to be used in Router Advertisements (RAs) to communicate prefixes of Network Address and Protocol Translation from IPv6 clients to IPv4 servers (NAT64) to hosts.

Status of This Memo

This is an Internet Standards Track document.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on Internet Standards is available in Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8781>.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Requirements Language
 - 1.2. Terminology
- 2. Use Cases for Communicating the NAT64 Prefix to Hosts
- 3. Why Include the NAT64 Prefix in Router Advertisements?
- 4. Option Format
 - 4.1. Scaled Lifetime Processing
- 5. Usage Guidelines
 - 5.1. Handling Multiple NAT64 Prefixes
 - 5.2. PREF64 Consistency
- 6. IANA Considerations
- 7. Security Considerations
- 8. References
 - 8.1. Normative References
 - 8.2. Informative References

Acknowledgements

Authors' Addresses

1. Introduction

NAT64 [RFC6146] with DNS Extensions for Network Address Translation from IPv6 clients to IPv4 servers (DNS64) [RFC6147] is a widely deployed mechanism to provide IPv4 access on IPv6-only networks. In various scenarios, the host must be aware of the NAT64 prefix in use by the network. This document specifies a Neighbor Discovery [RFC4861] option to be used in Router Advertisements (RAs) to communicate NAT64 prefixes to hosts.

1.1. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

1.2. Terminology

PREF64 (or NAT64 prefix): An IPv6 prefix used for IPv6 address synthesis [RFC6146];

NAT64: Network Address and Protocol Translation from IPv6 clients to IPv4 servers [RFC6146];

Router Advertisement (RA): A message used by IPv6 routers to advertise their presence together with various link and Internet parameters [RFC4861];

DNS64: a mechanism for synthesizing AAAA records from A records [RFC6147];

2. Use Cases for Communicating the NAT64 Prefix to Hosts

On networks employing NAT64, it is useful for hosts to know the NAT64 prefix for several reasons, including the following:

- Enabling DNS64 functions on end hosts. In particular:
 - Local DNSSEC validation (DNS64 in stub-resolver mode). As discussed in [RFC6147], Section 2, the stub resolver in the host "will try to obtain (real) AAAA RRs, and in case they are not available, the DNS64 function will synthesize AAAA RRs for internal usage." Therefore, to perform the DNS64 function, the stub resolver needs to know the NAT64 prefix. This is required in order to use DNSSEC on a NAT64 network.
 - Trusted DNS server. AAAA synthesis is required for the host to be able to use a DNS server not provided by the network (e.g., a DNS-over-TLS [RFC7858] or DNS-over-HTTPS [RFC8484] server with which the host has an existing trust relationship).
 - Networks with no DNS64 server. Hosts that support AAAA synthesis and are aware of the NAT64 prefix in use do not need the network to perform the DNS64 function at all.
- Enabling NAT64 address-translation functions on end hosts. For example:
 - IPv4 address literals on an IPv6-only host. As described in [RFC8305], Section 7.1, IPv6-only hosts connecting to IPv4 address literals can translate the IPv4 literal to an IPv6 literal.
 - 464XLAT [RFC6877]. 464XLAT requires the host be aware of the NAT64 prefix.

3. Why Include the NAT64 Prefix in Router Advertisements?

Fate sharing:

NAT64 requires routing to be configured. IPv6 routing configuration requires receiving an IPv6 RA [RFC4861]. Therefore, using RAs to provide hosts with the NAT64 prefix ensures that NAT64 reachability information shares the fate of the rest of the network configuration on the host.

Atomic configuration: Including the NAT64 prefix in the RA minimizes the number of packets required to configure a host. Only one packet (an RA) is required to complete the network configuration. This speeds up the process of connecting to a network that supports NAT64/DNS64. It also simplifies host implementation by removing the possibility that the host can have an incomplete Layer 3 configuration (e.g., IPv6 addresses and prefixes, but no NAT64 prefix).

Updatability: It is possible to change the NAT64 prefix at any time, because when it changes, it is possible to notify hosts by sending a new RA.

Deployability: All IPv6 hosts and networks are required to support Neighbor Discovery [RFC4861] so just a minor extension to the existing implementation is required. Other options, such as [RFC7225], require implementing other protocols (e.g., Port Control Protocol (PCP) [RFC7225]), which could be considered an obstacle for deployment.

4. Option Format




Figure 1: NAT64 Prefix Option Format

Fields:

Type	8-bit identifier of the PREF64 option type (38)
Length	8-bit unsigned integer. The length of the option (including the Type and Length fields) is in units of 8 octets. The sender MUST set the length to 2. The receiver MUST ignore the PREF64 option if the Length field value is not 2.
Scaled Lifetime	13-bit unsigned integer. The maximum time in units of 8 seconds over which this NAT64 prefix MAY be used. See Section 4.1 for the Scaled Lifetime field processing rules.

PLC (Prefix Length Code)	3-bit unsigned integer. This field encodes the NAT64 Prefix Length defined in [RFC6052]. The PLC field values 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 indicate the NAT64 prefix length of 96, 64, 56, 48, 40, and 32 bits, respectively. The receiver MUST ignore the PREF64 option if the Prefix Length Code field is not set to one of those values.
Highest 96 bits of the Prefix	96-bit unsigned integer. Contains bits 0 - 95 of the NAT64 prefix.

Table 1: NAT64 Prefix Option Format Fields

4.1. Scaled Lifetime Processing

It would be highly undesirable for the NAT64 prefix to have a lifetime shorter than the Router Lifetime, which is defined in Section 4.2 of [RFC4861] as a 16-bit unsigned integer. If the NAT64 prefix lifetime is not at least equal to the default Router Lifetime, it might lead to scenarios in which the NAT64 prefix lifetime expires before the arrival of the next unsolicited RA. Therefore, the Scaled Lifetime encodes the NAT64 prefix lifetime in units of 8 seconds. The receiver **MUST** multiply the Scaled Lifetime value by 8 (for example, by a logical left shift) to calculate the maximum time in seconds the prefix **MAY** be used. The maximum lifetime of the NAT64 prefix is thus 65528 seconds. To ensure that the NAT64 prefix does not expire before the default router, it is **NOT RECOMMENDED** to configure default Router Lifetimes greater than 65528 seconds when using this option. A lifetime of 0 indicates that the prefix **SHOULD NOT** be used anymore.

By default, the value of the Scaled Lifetime field **SHOULD** be set to the lesser of $3 \times \text{MaxRtrAdvInterval}$ [RFC4861] divided by 8, or 8191.

Router vendors **SHOULD** allow administrators to specify nonzero lifetime values that are not divisible by 8. In such cases, the router **SHOULD** round the provided value up to the nearest integer that is divisible by 8 and smaller than 65536, then divide the result by 8 (or perform a logical right shift by 3) and set the Scaled Lifetime field to the resulting value. If a nonzero lifetime value that is to be divided by 8 (or subjected to a logical right shift by 3) is less than 8, then the Scaled Lifetime field **SHOULD** be set to 1. This last step ensures that lifetimes under 8 seconds are encoded as a nonzero Scaled Lifetime.

5. Usage Guidelines

This option specifies exactly one NAT64 prefix for all IPv4 destinations. If the network operator wants to route different parts of the IPv4 address space to different NAT64 devices, this can be accomplished by routing more specific subprefixes of the NAT64 prefix to those devices. For example, suppose an operator is using the [RFC1918] address space 10.0.0.0/8 internally. That operator might want to route 10.0.0.0/8 through NAT64 device A, and the rest of the IPv4 space through NAT64 device B. If the operator's NAT64 prefix is 2001:db8:a:b::/96, then the operator can route 2001:db8:a:b::a00:0/104 to NAT64 A and 2001:db8:a:b::/96 to NAT64 B.

This option may appear more than once in an RA (e.g., when gracefully renumbering the network from one NAT64 prefix to another). Host behavior with regard to synthesizing IPv6 addresses from IPv4 addresses **SHOULD** follow the recommendations given in [Section 3 of \[RFC7050\]](#), limited to the NAT64 prefixes that have a nonzero lifetime.

In a network (or a provisioning domain) that provides both IPv4 and NAT64, it may be desirable for certain IPv4 addresses not to be translated. An example might be private address ranges that are local to the network/provisioning domain and that should not be reached through the NAT64. This type of configuration cannot be conveyed to hosts using this option, or through other NAT64 prefix provisioning mechanisms such as [\[RFC7050\]](#) or [\[RFC7225\]](#). This problem does not apply in IPv6-only networks: the host in an IPv6-only network does not have an IPv4 address and cannot reach any IPv4 destinations without the NAT64.

5.1. Handling Multiple NAT64 Prefixes

In some cases, a host may receive multiple NAT64 prefixes from different sources. Possible scenarios include (but are not limited to):

- the host is using multiple mechanisms to discover PREF64 prefixes (e.g., by using PCP [\[RFC7225\]](#)) and/or resolving an IPv4-only fully qualified domain name [\[RFC7050\]](#) in addition to receiving the PREF64 RA option);
- the PREF64 option presents in a single RA more than once;
- the host receives multiple RAs with different PREF64 prefixes on a given interface.

When multiple PREF64s are discovered via the RA PREF64 Option (either the Option presents more than once in a single RA or multiple RAs are received), host behavior with regard to synthesizing IPv6 addresses from IPv4 addresses **SHOULD** follow the recommendations given in [Section 3 of \[RFC7050\]](#), limited to the NAT64 prefixes that have a nonzero lifetime.

When different PREF64s are discovered using multiple mechanisms, hosts **SHOULD** select one source of information only. The **RECOMMENDED** order is:

- PCP-discovered prefixes [\[RFC7225\]](#), if supported;
- PREF64s discovered via the RA Option;
- PREF64s resolving an IPv4-only fully qualified domain name [\[RFC7050\]](#)

Note: If the network provides PREF64s via both this RA Option and [\[RFC7225\]](#), hosts that receive the PREF64 via the RA Option may choose to use it immediately (before waiting for the PCP to complete); therefore, some traffic may not reflect any more detailed configuration provided by the PCP.

The host **SHOULD** treat the PREF64 as being specific to the network interface it was received on. Hosts that are aware of Provisioning Domain (PvD, [\[RFC7556\]](#)) **MUST** treat the PREF64 as being scoped to the implicit or explicit PvD.

5.2. PREF64 Consistency

Section 6.2.7 of [RFC4861] recommends that routers inspect RAs sent by other routers to ensure that all routers onlink advertise consistent information. Routers **SHOULD** inspect valid PREF64 options received on a given link and verify the consistency. Detected inconsistencies indicate that one or more routers might be misconfigured. Routers **SHOULD** log such cases to system or network management. Routers **SHOULD** check and compare the following information:

- set of PREF64s with a nonzero lifetime;
- set of PREF64s with a zero lifetime.

Routers that are aware of PvD ([RFC7556]) **MUST** only compare information scoped to the same implicit or explicit PvD.

6. IANA Considerations

IANA has assigned a new IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Option type for the PREF64 option defined in this document in the "IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Option Formats" registry [IANA].

Description	Type
PREF64 option	38

Table 2: New IANA Registry Assignment

7. Security Considerations

Because RAs are required in all IPv6 configuration scenarios, on IPv6-only networks, RAs must already be secured -- e.g., by deploying an RA-Guard [RFC6105]. Providing all configuration in RAs reduces the attack surface to be targeted by malicious attackers trying to provide hosts with invalid configuration, as compared to distributing the configuration through multiple different mechanisms that need to be secured independently.

If a host is provided with an incorrect NAT64 prefix, the IPv6-only host might not be able to communicate with IPv4-only destinations. Connectivity to destinations reachable over IPv6 would not be impacted just by providing a host with an incorrect prefix; however, if attackers are capable of sending rogue RAs, they can perform denial-of-service or man-in-the-middle attacks, as described in [RFC6104].

The security measures that must already be in place to ensure that RAs are only received from legitimate sources eliminate the problem of NAT64 prefix validation described in Section 3.1 of [RFC7050].

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [IANA] IANA, "Internet Control Message Protocol version 6 (ICMPv6) Parameters", <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/icmpv6-parameters>>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", RFC 4861, DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.
- [RFC6052] Bao, C., Huitema, C., Bagnulo, M., Boucadair, M., and X. Li, "IPv6 Addressing of IPv4/IPv6 Translators", RFC 6052, DOI 10.17487/RFC6052, October 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6052>>.
- [RFC7050] Savolainen, T., Korhonen, J., and D. Wing, "Discovery of the IPv6 Prefix Used for IPv6 Address Synthesis", RFC 7050, DOI 10.17487/RFC7050, November 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7050>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

8.2. Informative References

- [RFC1918] Rekhter, Y., Moskowitz, B., Karrenberg, D., de Groot, G. J., and E. Lear, "Address Allocation for Private Internets", BCP 5, RFC 1918, DOI 10.17487/RFC1918, February 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1918>>.
- [RFC6104] Chown, T. and S. Venaas, "Rogue IPv6 Router Advertisement Problem Statement", RFC 6104, DOI 10.17487/RFC6104, February 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6104>>.
- [RFC6105] Levy-Abegnoli, E., Van de Velde, G., Popoviciu, C., and J. Mohacsi, "IPv6 Router Advertisement Guard", RFC 6105, DOI 10.17487/RFC6105, February 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6105>>.
- [RFC6146] Bagnulo, M., Matthews, P., and I. van Beijnum, "Stateful NAT64: Network Address and Protocol Translation from IPv6 Clients to IPv4 Servers", RFC 6146, DOI 10.17487/RFC6146, April 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6146>>.

- [RFC6147] Bagnulo, M., Sullivan, A., Matthews, P., and I. van Beijnum, "DNS64: DNS Extensions for Network Address Translation from IPv6 Clients to IPv4 Servers", RFC 6147, DOI 10.17487/RFC6147, April 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6147>>.
- [RFC6877] Mawatari, M., Kawashima, M., and C. Byrne, "464XLAT: Combination of Stateful and Stateless Translation", RFC 6877, DOI 10.17487/RFC6877, April 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6877>>.
- [RFC7225] Boucadair, M., "Discovering NAT64 IPv6 Prefixes Using the Port Control Protocol (PCP)", RFC 7225, DOI 10.17487/RFC7225, May 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7225>>.
- [RFC7556] Anipko, D., Ed., "Multiple Provisioning Domain Architecture", RFC 7556, DOI 10.17487/RFC7556, June 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7556>>.
- [RFC7858] Hu, Z., Zhu, L., Heidemann, J., Mankin, A., Wessels, D., and P. Hoffman, "Specification for DNS over Transport Layer Security (TLS)", RFC 7858, DOI 10.17487/RFC7858, May 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7858>>.
- [RFC8305] Schinazi, D. and T. Pauly, "Happy Eyeballs Version 2: Better Connectivity Using Concurrency", RFC 8305, DOI 10.17487/RFC8305, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8305>>.
- [RFC8484] Hoffman, P. and P. McManus, "DNS Queries over HTTPS (DoH)", RFC 8484, DOI 10.17487/RFC8484, October 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8484>>.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following people (in alphabetical order) for their review and feedback: Mikael Abrahamsson, Mark Andrews, Brian E Carpenter, David Farmer, Nick Heatley, Robert Hinden, Martin Hunek, Tatuya Jinmei, Benjamin Kaduk, Erik Kline, Suresh Krishnan, Warren Kumari, David Lamparter, Barry Leiba, Jordi Palet Martinez, Tommy Pauly, Alexandre Petrescu, Michael Richardson, David Schinazi, Ole Troan, Eric Vynke, Bernie Volz.

Authors' Addresses

Lorenzo Colitti

Google

Shibuya 3-21-3, Tokyo

150-0002

Japan

Email: lorenzo@google.com

Jen Linkova

Google

1 Darling Island Rd

Pyrmont NSW 2009

Australia

Email: furry@google.com