



Global IPv6 Strategies

From Business Analysis
to Operational Planning

**Patrick Grossetete
Ciprian P. Popoviciu
Fred Wettling**



Global IPv6 Strategies:

From Business Analysis to Operational Planning

Patrick Grossetete, Ciprian Popoviciu, Fred Wettling

Copyright© 2008 Cisco Systems, Inc.

Published by:

Cisco Press

800 East 96th Street

Indianapolis, IN 46240 USA

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher, except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review.

Printed in the United States of America

First Printing May 2008

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Grossetete, Patrick.

Global IPV6 strategies : from business analysis to operational planning / Patrick Grossetete, Ciprian Popoviciu, Fred Wettling.

p. cm.

ISBN 978-1-58705-343-6 (pbk.)

1. TCP/IP (Computer network protocol)
2. Computer networks--Planning.
3. Computer networks--Management--Case studies. I. Popoviciu, Ciprian. II. Wettling, Fred. III. Title.

TK5105.585.G76 2008

004.6'2--dc22

2008015715

ISBN-13: 978-1-58705-343-6

ISBN-10: 1-58705-343-8

Warning and Disclaimer

This book is designed to provide information about IPv6 from a market perspective and to describe adoption trends and strategies, not to cover the technology itself. Every effort has been made to make this book as complete and as accurate as possible, but no warranty or fitness is implied.

The information is provided on an “as is” basis. The authors, Cisco Press, and Cisco Systems, Inc. shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damages arising from the information contained in this book or from the use of the discs or programs that may accompany it.

The opinions expressed in this book belong to the authors and are not necessarily those of Cisco Systems, Inc.

Foreword

Thirty years ago, when the original team of engineers started to design the Internet technology, none of them could have imagined that this technology eventually would be widely used not only in universities and laboratories but also in enterprises and residences all over the world.

IPv6—Internet Protocol version 6—is the key word. Remarkably, without knowing that the Internet would become so ubiquitous, these engineers designed IPv4, the first widely deployed version of the TCP/IP network layer, in such a way that it has been able to support the tremendous growth of the Internet to date. However, public IPv4 address space is becoming increasingly scarce as heavily populated countries such as India and China and market places such as the cellular phone market converge to IP. The solution is IPv6.

IPv6 adoption represents the necessary step to prepare for the future Internet, addressing the gap between increasing resource needs and available technology to meet the demand. A useful analogy is the transition from old local analog telephone systems and dialing plans to the international telephone numbering system used today. More digits were added and communications infrastructures were overhauled over time resulting in improved global access and new telephony markets based on common standards. The basic protocols used for Internet communications are going through a similar transformation that will have a much more significant impact on the ways the world communicates.

IPv6 offers a larger address space that can handle the spectacular growth in the adoption of the Internet and Internet-based technologies worldwide. If you are not convinced that IPv6 represents the future of the Internet, consider that recent versions of computer operating systems such as Apple Mac OS 10.5 Leopard, Microsoft Windows Vista, and Windows Server 2008 have IPv6 set up as the default. These operating systems are ready for the next generation, IPv6-enabled Internet.

NOTE

It is important to consider the Internet in its globality. The continued rapid evolution of the Internet and products and services connected it is creating challenges of the largest update ever attempted to a business infrastructure.

Many books about IPv6 technology have already been published, but this is the first that is intended specifically for people like you who determine the future IT strategies of organizations. Although you may not need to understand every detail of computer and communication technologies to make your decisions, you do need to understand the impact of technologies that are important for the future of your organization, one of which is IPv6.

The authors of this book have been friends of mine for many years, especially Patrick. We at NTT are the most advanced IPv6 adopters in the world; Patrick has been working with us to develop our network worldwide. Therefore, I'm confident that this is the best author team not only to explain the details of this technology, but also to make other people understand why this technology is so important.

We look forward to seeing many "decision makers" read this book and ask their IT partners (ISPs, vendors, and system integrators) to install this new key technology, IPv6, in their network environments. I believe that will help the organization grow more toward the future.

Shin Miyakawa, PhD
Director, IPv6 Team, Network Project
Innovative IP Architecture Center
NTT Communications Corporation

Introduction

The continued evolution and operation of the Internet as a truly global asset faces multiple challenges: impending exhaustion of the global IPv4 address space, new operating systems and applications, next generation infrastructures, and demand for always-on connectivity for a growing variety of devices. The requirements of a new Internet, the pressure generated by the lack of resources for the existing one, and government mandates are just a few drivers for the soaring interest in IPv6 and the demand for information related to the protocol. The technological aspects of the next generation Internet protocol have been diligently covered through a wide range of publications. Considering, the potential implications of early versus late IPv6 adoption, there is significant interest in information related to adoption strategies, to business perspectives on IPv6 use, and to concrete experiences.

The global impact of a technology or a set of technologies on the larger population and the society as a whole can truly be evaluated years after its creation when enough data has been accumulated for a proper analysis. As an example, the unprecedented, wide range of advances made in all domains of life (arts, education, politics, philosophy, literature, and science) during the Renaissance period, one of the most prolific periods in human history, can be traced to the adoption of one technology: printing. Gutenberg's invention increased the amount of documented knowledge and information by reducing the costs of capturing it. More importantly, printing dramatically increased accessibility to knowledge and information by reducing the replication costs. One technology enabled human civilization to build its knowledge base and to tap into a significantly larger pool of talent. These scaled-up resources were the information and communication infrastructure that enabled innovations in all aspects of human life.

In itself, the "moveable type" technology, as Gutenberg called it, was not the prize but just the enabler. Gutenberg's enterprise defaulted shortly after a promising start but it enabled an information revolution that was the catalyst of many other revolutions. The often drawn parallel between the discovery and history of printing and that of the Internet highlights the same characteristic. The Internet represents the enabler of today's information revolution, changing the way we live, play, learn, and work.

A close evaluation of the two information revolutions highlights a very important difference. The printing-based revolution was to a certain extent asymmetric—it somewhat reduced the cost of producing content while it vastly reduced the cost of accessing content. This paradigm was further supported and expanded in scope through other media means such as radio and television. Although in its initial implementation stages the Internet appeared to do the same thing, as it matured, it enabled a more symmetric information revolution by dramatically decreasing the costs of producing content. The Internet is reducing the costs of producing and consuming information, and bringing together enough users to create an audience for any niche content. In addition, the Internet is providing its users with ubiquitous global access to information, removing the distance and time barriers faced in the past. The Internet has laid the foundation for a new and different information revolution. While traditional media such as newspaper, radio, and television cater to the mainstream, the Internet addresses new audiences and enables new means of communications and new business models.

It is important to make a clear distinction between the Internet and the applications that run over it. These applications are apparent to most of its users and are the true measure of the economic and societal impact of the Internet. With the exception of technologists, however, the terms Internet (infrastructure) and World Wide Web (application) are for most people interchangeable. While like many other technologies such as railroads, automobiles, and radio, the Internet inspired its own economic bubble, it survives, continues to grow, and provides the environment for truly valuable applications and services. This infrastructure and its evolution is the focus of this book despite the necessary references to its uses.

From its initial deployment as a research network to its current state, the Internet as an infrastructure has seen the functionality of the devices, applications, and services deployed on it grow in direct relation to its capabilities, capacity, and scale:

- **Higher speeds:** The Internet is leveraging newer technologies providing wired or wireless access with ever-increasing bandwidths and lower costs.

-
- **Larger footprint:** The “network of networks,” as the Internet is known, continues to expand its geographical coverage and to include more and more businesses and people.
 - **Including more device types:** The Internet evolved from interconnecting large mainframes with dumb terminals to connecting personal computers, mobile phones, and sensors.
 - **Always-on connectivity:** Ubiquitous in nature, the Internet enables its users to communicate continuously regardless of their point of attachment.

To support Web 2.0, which encompasses the latest set of Internet-based applications and services, the infrastructure continues to evolve through the so-called Next Generation Networks. Web 2.0 is finally taking advantage of the Internet’s true potential and distances by its immediate “people-to-people” collaborative environment from the technologies that expanded the information revolution started by printing. Web 2.0 is starting the next information revolution, and for that it requires an ever-increasing user base, individually addressable users, and symmetric (similar upstream and downstream bandwidth), always-on, mobile connections. Will the technology be able to cope with these demands?

Although today nobody could envisage a world without Internet connectivity, the original design of the Internet Protocol, the foundation of this infrastructure, did not foresee this level of adoption. IP simply does not have the resources to connect today’s earth population let alone to support its growth over the coming years. Moreover, in an attempt to conserve resources, the Internet today lost the symmetry of its original brilliant design. This is why the time is high for a new version of the Internet Protocol, known as IPv6, a necessary evolution for this mature technology.

As is the case with any foundational, infrastructure technology, the importance and economic impact of this evolution might be difficult to measure. Although the upgrade is an inevitable process, misunderstanding its importance and delaying its planning and adoption can have a significant impact at micro- and macroeconomic levels. This is particularly the case with infrastructure technologies that benefit from very little attention from a market driven mostly by short-term delivery. The right perspective on the evolution of the infrastructure needs to be bootstrapped by strategic, global, and visionary thinking. On January

16, 2003, the National Infrastructure Advisory Council (NIAC) was presented an IPv6 strawman proposal by John Chambers, who at the time was one of its members. In his letter to the council, Chambers stated:

We believe the United States needs a migration strategy built on a solid investigation of the issues surrounding IPv6 adoption, and therefore propose that the United States National Infrastructure Advisory Council (NIAC) recommend that the President establish a Task Force on IPv6 to develop a national policy on its adoption. Such a policy should cover the U.S. Federal government and the critical infrastructure industry sectors.

Despite weak market interest in IPv6 at that time, NIAC's catalytic initiative was followed by coordinated government efforts, highlighted by the 2003 DoD and the 2005 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) IPv6 mandates. These efforts led to increased IPv6 interest within the United States and helped reverse its falling behind other nations in terms of understanding and adopting the new protocol.

The goal of this book is to provide a global overview of the strategies that developed around the IPv6 adoption and the perspectives taken on it within various markets. Although several sections briefly cover some technical aspects of the protocol, the objective of the book is to complement the technological viewpoint offered by a growing number of publications in the market with a business perspective. IPv6 adoption drivers and trends are reviewed at international, national, and business levels and some of the practical lessons learned are shared through concrete case studies. It turns out that a smooth and optimal integration of IPv6 depends as much on a good adoption strategy as it depends on understanding the technology.

Goals and Methods

This book intends to provide a business perspective on IPv6 and its adoption, complementing the many technical IPv6 titles available today. It also intends to provide the readers with some of the “whys” and the “whens” applied to IPv6 strategies and some of the “hows” discovered through implementation experience by various organizations, countries, and market segments around the world. If the

clamor of IPv6 has reached your desk and you simply want to understand what the big deal is, this book will bring you up to speed.

To that end, the book will present you information that answers the following questions:

- In a nutshell, what are the real technical benefits of IPv6?
- What are some of the business and technical opportunities presented by IPv6?
- What IPv6 adoption strategies have emerged in various markets and throughout the world?
- What did other organizations do to adopt IPv6?
- How do I prepare my organization for IPv6?

The book combines market analysis and case study methods to provide the current state of IPv6 adoption. It also provides practical guidelines based on the extensive IPv6 planning and deployment experience of the authors.

Who Should Read This Book?

In the experience of the authors, the big questions of “Why IPv6?” “When IPv6?” and “How IPv6?” are, in various forms and at various levels of intensity, on the minds of all people who are connected with the IT-related aspects of their organizations. These questions still bother the (by now IPv6 savvy) networking specialist as well as the CIOs who start to see IPv6 sneak in among the usual hot topics of VoIP and security. Regardless of their level of familiarity with the protocol, technical and business professionals alike want to understand what drives the IPv6 adoption and to see concrete examples of IPv6 strategies.

This book should be read by IT professionals, by IT department managers, by senior managers, and by executives of all organizations leveraging an IP infrastructure. It should also be of interest to people in academia and to government officials who work on IT-related, government initiatives.

How This Book Is Organized

The structure of the book was developed to start with the larger context of the economic and business importance of IP communications and to gradually focus on the various aspects of the IP upgrade. One chapter is dedicated to debunking some of the common IPv6 technology myths in order to set a realistic baseline for the discussion. The review of perspectives on IPv6 is paired with examples of developed and implemented adoption strategies. The final chapter provides IPv6 integration planning tips gleaned from the lessons learned by organizations that went through the process.

The six chapters of this book cover the following topics:

- **Chapter 1, “The Business and Economic Importance of IP Communications:”** This chapter reviews the importance of the Internet in today’s economy. It explains why the Internet infrastructure became a strategic asset for nations, enterprises, and service providers. It also reviews the market trends toward an IP convergence that leads to rapid growth of the overall Internet infrastructure and drives the need for an evolution of the Internet protocol.
- **Chapter 2, “IPv4 or IPv6—Myths and Realities:”** This chapter discusses the original case for developing IPv6 as presented by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It provides additional arguments in support of developing a new version of IP based on protocol adoption trends and statistics such as the growing world population. The discussion focuses on some technical aspects of the protocol by reviewing the most popular and notorious IPv4-IPv6 myths that you may encounter regularly in the press and open forums.
- **Chapter 3, “The Economy of an IP Evolution:”** This chapter takes a closer look at the constraints presented by an IPv4 infrastructure to national economies and individual businesses. By eliminating these constraints, an IP upgrade opens a set of new opportunities that are less apparent drivers for IPv6 adoption. This chapter presents a more realistic perspective on adoption drivers, a perspective that takes into consideration the foundational nature of the technology considered and departs from the simplistic ROI-based approach.

-
- **Chapter 4, “IPv6 Adoption Strategies:”** This chapter maps some of the adoption drivers analyzed in Chapter 3 to IPv6 adoption strategies that emerged at the beginning of the 21st century. Both “national” and “business” strategies are analyzed independently in a structure that matches that of Chapter 3. Along with the descriptions of strategies, this chapter presents some of the adoption challenges faced by the industry.
 - **Chapter 5, “Analysis of Business Cases for IPv6: Case Studies:”** This chapter is the core of this book, emphasizing its focus on providing practical information that can be applied in developing IPv6 adoption strategies. The chapter builds on the analysis offered in Chapter 4 by offering concrete, real-life examples of IPv6 strategies developed by various organizations in various markets. The case studies highlight the profile of the organizations in order to help the reader to put the strategies in the proper context and to be able to relate to the environments described. The case studies present the perspective that these organizations have on IPv6 and the drivers they identified for developing the IPv6 strategy. Planning and implementation suggestions and challenges are also discussed.
 - **Chapter 6, “Planning Your IPv6 Migration:”** As a corollary to the case studies, this final chapter reviews key aspects related to IPv6 planning. It steers away from technology discussions, a topic covered extensively in other books, and focuses on mandatory steps an organization has to take toward a successful and cost-effective deployment of IPv6. There is a lot more to consider in building an IPv6 strategy than the technology itself. This chapter summarizes the experiences gained to date with respect to this process.

Where to Go from Here

Although the industry has reached consensus regarding the inevitability of an IP upgrade, the time to start on that path is largely dependent on the market an organization belongs to, on its long-term vision, and on the national and international environment in which it operates. The timing of an IPv6 adoption is

ultimately similar to that of adopting other technologies. It is the result of balancing the benefits and expenses of being an early adopter with the risks of being a late adopter. The important thing in the case of IPv6 is to realize that it is a foundational technology and the benefits or risks of adoption, although potentially significant, might be less apparent. This aspect of IPv6 and its adoption has been made clear by the complex market perception of and approach to the topic.

At the end of this book, if you feel better positioned to confidently define an IPv6 strategy for your organization or you are better informed to understand the reasoning behind IPv6-focused policies enforced within your organization, then this book has achieved its goals. The authors intend to bridge the gap between the technology and the business dimensions of IPv6 to shed some light on a technological evolution with potentially revolutionary business outcomes.

So what's next? A reader with a taste for technology can follow up with books focused on the protocol and its deployment such as *Deploying IPv6 Networks* by Cisco Press. Most importantly, you can analyze your organization's IPv6 requirements and apply some of the lessons learned here to the development of an IPv6 strategy that ensures its efficient, cost effective, and timely integration in the existing or next generation IP infrastructure.

CHAPTER 2

IPv4 or IPv6— Myths and Realities



The year is 1977. Earth's population has not yet reached 4.5 billion. One hundred and eleven interconnected computing machines make up the ARPANET, a research network.

Thirty years later, in 2008, Earth's population peaks at 6.6 billion and the Internet, with a population of 1.3 billion, has yet to reach 22 percent penetration rate, the threshold that qualifies it as a massively adopted technology. While arguing about the lifetime scope of the available IPv4 address space, the Internet community aggressively pursues a massive convergence of communication technologies (audio, data, video, and voice) over IP. The community is still debating the urgency of an upgrade to IPv6.

In the year 2030, Earth's population is expected to be over 8 billion, adding nearly 75 million people every year, or twice the population of the state of California. The Internet is an integral part of the worldwide economy and everybody's life. The old IPv4 versus IPv6 debate is now history.

NOTE

For more information on the history of the Internet, visit <http://www.isoc.org/internet/history/brief.shtml>.

Statistics related to the Earth's population and Internet adoption were collected from, respectively:

- <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/worldpopinfo.html>
 - <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>
-

The Business Case for IPv6

To a large degree, mass adoption of new technology is fueled by a person's vision of "What's in it for me?" Can the new technology improve my business operations? Can I use it to provide a new profitable service? Is adoption needed to stay competitive? Will the new technology enrich my personal life?

At the end of the '70s, few of the IP designers envisioned the rapid and widespread adoption of IP; IP became *the* convergence layer for communication services in many industry segments such as home, mobile wireless, transportation,

media, and many others. This convergence, along with a plethora of new Internet-enabled devices, provides a fertile and unexpected foundation for innovation that far exceeds the original design constructs. Information movement is now the game, and content is king.

So is an Internet upgrade necessary to sustain the growth of the future and to interconnect all the devices of the new global economy? Will IPv6 provide the fire to fuel the growth?

Before debating the pros and cons of the new IP version, let's look at the historical perspective of IPv6 and its development.

A Brief History of IPv6 Standardization

At the end of the '80s, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) began to evaluate the consequences of the Internet's growth on the protocol, with particular emphasis on addressing. The organization evaluated:

- **Address space exhaustion:** The original IPv4 addressing plan was mathematically limited to 65,536 Class B networks for the entire Internet. The assignment rate of the former Class B networks (blocks of 65,536 contiguous addresses) would lead to the exhaustion of IPv4 addresses sometime close to 1994.
- **Expanding routing tables:** The allocation of Class C (blocks of 256 contiguous IPv4 addresses) networks instead of Class B networks would lead to an alarming expansion of the routing tables in the Internet backbone routers—typically Cisco AGS+ or 7000 series.

NOTE

Readers who want to learn more about the IPv6 history should refer to IETF Request For Comments (RFC) 1752, *The Recommendation for the IP Next Generation Protocol*, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc1752>.

In November 1991, the IETF formed the Routing and Addressing (ROAD) working group (WG) to analyze and deliver guidelines to address these issues. In March 1992, the WG provided its recommendations in two categories:

- **Immediate:** Adopt the Classless Interdomain Routing (CIDR) route aggregation to control the growth rate of routing tables and allow finer-grained allocations than previous 8-bit boundaries defined as Class A, B, and C.

IPv4 Class	CIDR Notation	IP Addresses
A	256	16,777,216
B	65,536	65,536
C	16,777,216	256

- **Long term:** Initiate a call for proposals “to form working groups to explore separate approaches for bigger Internet addresses.”

At the beginning of the '90s, the use of the Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model's network and transport layers was heavily promoted through the U.S. and UK Government Open Systems Interconnect Profile (GOSIP). In the end, it failed to get widely deployed due to the lack of applications running over OSI. Nevertheless, by mid-1992, the Internet Advisory Board (IAB) proposed, as an immediate solution, the use of Connectionless Network Protocol (CLNP), which would be the basis for a next generation IP, naming it IP version 7. This proposal was highly debated because OSI was not viewed favorably at the IETF. The IAB recommendation was rejected by the IETF, which called for a number of working groups to work on candidate proposals. In 1993, an IETF IP Next Generation Decision Process (ipdecide) Birds of a Feather (BoF) session set the criteria that would drive the definition of the new protocol. The end result was the creation of an Internet Protocol Next Generation (IPng) directorate that was tasked to

- Define the scope of the IPng effort, keeping in mind the time constraints
- Develop a clear and concise set of technical requirements and operational criteria for IPng
- Recommend which of the current IPng protocol candidates to accept, if any

NOTE RFC 1550, *IP: Next Generation (IPng) White Paper Solicitation*, can be reviewed on the IETF website at <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc1550>.

Four parallel projects began exploring ways to address the identified consequences of the rapidly growing Internet:

- **CNAT:** Tivoli's Comprehensive Network Address Translator.
- **IP Encaps:** The proposal evolved to become IP Address Encapsulation (IPAE) and then merged with the SIP proposal.
- **Nimrod:** A proposal viewed as a research project by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG).
- **Simple CLNP:** The proposal later became TCP and UDP with Bigger Addresses (TUBA).

Three additional proposals were later brought into the discussion:

- **The P Internet Protocol (PIP):** The proposal merged later with SIP and the resulting working group called itself Simple Internet Protocol Plus (SIPP).
- **Simple Internet Protocol (SIP):** The proposal evolved to become IP Address Encapsulation (IPAE) and later merged with the SIP proposal.
- **TP/IX:** The proposal was later renamed Common Architecture for the Internet (CATNIP).

NOTE Projects that were fully documented received an IP version number from IANA. This explains the current allocation shown in the table on the following page.¹

continues

1. Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA), an operating unit of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), <http://www.iana.org/assignments/version-numbers>.

continued

Decimal	Keyword	Version	References
0–1		Reserved	[JBP] [RFC4828]
2–3		Unassigned	[JBP]
4	IP	Internet Protocol	[RFC791] [JBP]
5	ST	ST Datagram Mode	[RFC1190] [JWF]
6	IPv6	Internet Protocol version 6	[RFC1752]
7	TP/IX	TP/IX: The Next Internet	[RFC1475]
8	PIP	The P Internet Protocol	[RFC1621]
9	TUBA	TUBA	[RFC1347]
10–14		Unassigned	[JBP]
15		Reserved	[JBP]

The table answers a commonly asked question: Why IP version 6 and not 5 or 7? The table also clarifies the internationally accepted use of IPv9. This version of IP was temporarily used, without IANA approval, for a Chinese research project that intended to expand the IP address from the 32-bit IPv4 standard to 256 bits. While widely publicized as a next generation Internet, the project was shown to be limited in scope.²

All the work that went into these projects and the resulting mergers was finally evaluated by the IPng. Three proposals were retained: CATNIP, SIPP, and TUBA. As documented in RFC 1752:

None of these proposals were wrong nor were others right. All of the proposals would work in some ways providing a path to overcome the obstacles we face as the Internet expands. The task of the IPng Area was to ensure that the IETF understand the offered proposals, learn from the proposals and provide a recommendation on what path best resolves the basic issues while providing the best foundation upon which to build for the future.

2. For more information, see http://www.theregister.com/2004/07/06/ipv9_hype_dismissed.

After countless discussions and reviews of the strengths and weaknesses of updated versions of the submitted proposal, the consensus of the IPng Directorate was to recommend that the protocol described in the SIPP specification, which began as 64 bits and evolved to 128 bits, addressing should be adopted as the basis for IPng, that it should be the next generation of IP, and that it should be named IP version 6. The recommendation for IPng was approved by the IESG and became a proposed standard on November 17, 1994, as RFC 1752. This new version of IP can be considered an evolutionary step rather than a revolutionary step in the development of IP. Some of the principles that guided the changes are to

- Keep all aspects and features of IPv4 that were proven to work and continued to make sense
- Remove or make optional all features of IPv4 that were infrequently used or shown to be problematic
- Add new solutions to fix existent problems or add new features that enable the protocol to address new needs

The core set of IPv6 protocols was made an IETF Draft Standard on August 10, 1998, an event that represented the green light for vendors to develop their implementations and submit their code for interoperability testing. From 1996 to 2006, the experimental 6bone (<http://go6.net/ipv6-6bone/>) overlay IPv6 infrastructure offered the infrastructure framework for wide interoperability tests. In 2001, IPv6 started to be integrated on commercial products such as Sun Solaris 8, Cisco IOS Release 12.2(2)T, and Juniper JUNOS 5.1. The indication that IPv6 is technologically ready was the IETF intent to close or recharter the IPv6 WG in December 2006.

Is IPv6 ready for deployment in your business? Why should the world care about IPv6 today?

Looking at the Numbers

Initially, one of the main objectives of the IPng effort was to identify ways to cope with the explosive growth of the Internet. Today, this growth continues at a faster rate, reaffirming the premise of the IPng work. Making a business case for the new protocol comes down to a review of the numbers. From a global

perspective, these numbers were already described by one of the authors in the “e-Nations, The Internet for All” paper, which was endorsed by the United Nations.³

The Internet—an ever growing and widely popular environment for communication, information sharing, and collaboration—could simply not be promoted as a mass-market technology. In addition, the foundation of the worldwide economy would not work if the Internet’s base protocol (IP) did not offer the necessary address space resources to equitably connect the population of every country around the world.

The expansion of the Internet is also tied to the rapid development and market penetration of enabling technologies such as high-speed broadband and wireless access. Many enterprises have shifted from point-to-point, ATM, and Frame Relay infrastructures to IP-based local- and wide-area networks (LAN and WAN) for basic business operations. Traditional voice carriers are migrating their voice network to IP-based transport to reduce or eliminate future capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operational expenditure (OPEX) related to redundant parallel network infrastructures. These IP-based technologies modify an application’s landscape by changing the use of the Internet from a client/server model to a more distributed model or peer-to-peer model. Very rapid and successful adoption of distributed applications such as Voice over Internet (VoIP), instant messaging, content sharing, and Internet gaming leads people with “always-on” and “always-best” access to the Internet to be content producers as well as consumers. An expanded IP address space is necessary to support this paradigm change in the way the Internet is used.

Lack of IP resources can lead to an increasing digital divide between information and communications technology (ICT) rich and ICT poor countries. So let’s have a look at those “numbers” that make IPv6 a “must.”

Earth Population Versus Internet Users

By the end of 2007, world population reached over 6.6 billion humans⁴ and a United Nations report forecasts an increase to over 8 billion by 2030. Although the

3. <http://www.unicttaskforce.org/perl/documents.pl?id=1314>.

4. Source: *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency (ISSN 1553-8133), <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/xx.html#People>.

Internet is deeply embedded in the worldwide economy, it reaches only one-sixth of today's population with 1.3 billion users, as shown in Figure 2-1.




Figure 2-1 *Worldwide Internet Adoption and Population Statistics*⁵

Internet usage has seen accelerated growth across the world, particularly in emerging markets. For example, Africa, the region with the least Internet penetration, has seen the usage grow over 880 percent between 2000 and 2007. To provide equal opportunities worldwide, the Internet architecture must cope with rapid growth in consumer interest and usage. The forecast for growth leads to a new perspective on the demand for IP address space. Even without taking into consideration expected address allocation inefficiencies, IPv4's 32-bit address space is inadequate to support a plethora of connected devices owned by one-third of Earth's population.

5. <http://www.internetworldstats.com>.

NOTE “The efficiency of address space use” is measured through the Host-Density (HD) ratio defined in RFC 3194 and RFC 1715.

When accounting for expected growth, 50 percent of the worldwide population ends up without IPv4 address space to connect appliances to the Internet. Table 2-1 provides an analysis of the address space necessary to achieve 20 percent Internet penetration in each world region (expected growth has been accounted for).

Table 2-1 *The Population of World Regions and the IP Address Space Needed to Cover 20 Percent of the Population*

Region	Population	Number of /8 Subnets Needed for 20% of the Population with 1 Address per Person (HD Ratio 90%)
Africa	941,249,130	93
Asia	3,733,783,474	431
Europe	801,821,187	78
Latin America/Caribbean	569,133,474	53
Middle East	192,755,045	16
North America	334,659,631	30
Oceania/Australia	33,569,718	2
World	6,606,971,659	808

NOTE An HD ratio of 90 percent implies a very good utilization of the addressing resources.

As Table 2-1 indicates, as of February 2008, the world requires 808 IPv4 /8 subnets, more than twice the possible 256 /8 subnets, for the Internet to be considered a massively adopted technology. The IPv4 address space clearly cannot sustain the Internet’s penetration worldwide.

NOTE The number of /8 networks needed to allocate public IPv4 addresses for 20 percent adoption by the worldwide population as a whole is 808. The sum of the /8 networks needed by the individual regions to reach 20 percent adoption is 703. Regardless of the number used in the analysis, the IPv4 address space does not have sufficient resources to meet these needs.

The analysis in Table 2-1 assumes that each Internet user owns a public address. While this becomes a necessity for the latest usage patterns and the new peer-to-peer applications, it was quite common to have multiple Internet users sharing a global IPv4 address when dial-up was the main technology to connect to the Internet.

Highlighting the developing digital divide, it should be noted that as of June 2007, the population of the top 22 countries in Internet penetration represents 10 percent of the world's population.⁶ The Internet reached mass-adoption levels in only 99 (40 percent) of the world's 245 countries.

Mobile Phone Market Segment

For the past 15 years, Global System for Mobile (GSM) communications, along with other cellular technologies, has dramatically transformed daily life for billions of people. From Q2 CY07, the number of GSM connections, as shown in Table 2-2, has grown to pass the 3 billion mark in April 2008 globally, as announced by the GSMA, the global trade group for the mobile industry⁷

Table 2-2 *Number of GSM Connections Per Region^a*

Market	Connections in Q2 2007
World	2,377,790,703 (out of 2,831,345,390 wireless subscribers)
Africa	220,734,625
Americas	252,371,017
Asia Pacific	917,356,568

continues

6. <http://www.internetworldstats.com/top25.htm>.

7. http://www.gsmworld.com/news/press_2008/press08_31.shtml

Table 2-2 *Number of GSM Connections Per Region^a (Continued)*

Market	Connections in Q2 2007
Europe Eastern	359,637,084
Europe Western	387,248,744
Middle East	146,458,459
USA/Canada	93,984,206

a. <http://www.gsmworld.com/technology/what.shtml>.

Internet applications and services are not only possible via the public Wi-Fi and upcoming WiMAX infrastructures; they are also fully integrated, including IPv6 support, in the third and fourth generation telephony through the IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS). The new generation of wireless devices comes with an embedded dual IP stack and multimedia applications, including VoIP. The fierce competition between content providers seeking new revenues and increased market shares is leading to the delivery of new content and services over IP that will rely on always-on connectivity and end-to-end reachability. The combination of wireless and new broadband technologies such as DOCSIS 3.0 for cable or fiber to the home (FTTH) is leading to more and more independence of the service offering from the type or point of access and drives the market toward the convergence of fixed-mobile services.

NOTE Popular operating systems running on mobile phones are already offering dual-stack IPv4/IPv6 support, including the Symbian, Microsoft Windows Mobile 5 and 6, and Linux operating systems.

If just 50 percent of worldwide subscribers transition to those new technologies and services, they will require an additional 66 /8 networks for always-on connectivity. This example does not take into account the forecasted increase in the number of subscribers and the addresses required by the infrastructure supporting all these users.

Consumer Devices

The digital revolution that marked the end of the previous millennium brought a wide variety of devices into our lives. Although they entered the market as “gadgets,” many of these devices quickly became indispensable to many people. Gaming consoles (more than 150 million, including more than 44 million Sony PS3 and PSP), multimedia players, digital video recorders, digital cameras, and Global Positioning System (GPS) consoles are just a few examples of the many devices that are no longer a novelty.

The power of these new devices does not reside in their standalone operation but rather in the services they can offer when connected to other devices. The integration of IP over Ethernet and wireless technologies provides an environment where consumer devices can easily access resources and services. In order to communicate, these connected devices each use at least an IP address. Moreover, for full service and business model flexibility, these devices require public IP addresses. Their rapid adoption represents yet another source of pressure on the IPv4 address space.

Connected homes and public wireless LAN services represent perfect infrastructures to proliferate IP-enabled consumer devices. Although it is difficult to track such a diverse set of products, it is estimated that in 2006 there were 492 million connected consumer devices such as phones, computers, game consoles, and media centers. By 2010 that number is expected to reach 2.8 billion units.⁸ At one address per device and an HD ratio of 90 percent, these connected devices require 271 /8 prefixes (surpassing the total IPv4 address pool) and would need 1871 /8 prefixes by 2010. Many of these consumer devices could reuse private IPv4 addresses but this would limit the type of services available and the flexibility to adopt new business models while also increasing the cost of the applications supported.

The number of consumer devices, their need for global reachability, and their expected mobility outside of the home require a significantly larger address space than what IPv4 can offer. Unfettered growth and large-scale adoption are essential in this market space as it stimulates new service concepts and product innovation based on consumer requests. IPv6, with its large address space, is the natural answer to this market’s IP address needs. At the same time, IPv6 offers specific features, such as stateless autoconfiguration, that can reduce product costs, a great asset in a low-margin market.

8. <http://dhdeans.blogspot.com/2007/01/key-growth-statistics-on-connected.html>.

Transportation

A significant part of our day depends to a certain extent on one form of transportation or another. Public or private transportation takes us to and from our place of work; transportation provides the logistics that support our global economy; or perhaps transportation is the very scope of our business. Transportation can also make vacations possible or frustrating. In summary, we depend on various forms of transportation in our daily lives and the means by which we travel have us as a captive audience for a significant part of our day. The combination of wireless access and IP connectivity can provide significant business and increased revenue opportunities in the transportation market. Following are some opportunities for revenue:

- **Telematics:** Sensors distributed in a vehicle can monitor and manage its operation, providing new services to the vehicle owner, including the data for improved maintenance and troubleshooting. In late 2007, BMW's Research and Technology division unveiled its iDrive pilot program, which integrates the large number of control systems and entertainment systems through an integrated IP-based network. BMW's goal is to use a standards-based platform for future anticipated needs, simplify development and manufacturing, and reduce long-term costs. Rail systems are using telematics to manage spacing between trains to maximize passenger loads and improve safety.
- **Vehicle to vehicle:** Along with the development of telematic applications, communications between vehicles could be developed in conjunction with road infrastructures that work together to improve safety and prevent accidents. This type of environment integrates a wide range of wireless/wireline communications and control technologies in a framework developed by the Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) standards (ISO TC 204).
- **Fleet connectivity:** Transportation companies can leverage municipal Wi-Fi LANs and cellular broadband to connect their assets back to the central office. It is an effective and cost-saving mechanism to coordinate activities, synchronize inventory, and update routes. E-ticketing, real-time information for passengers, and video surveillance are typical applications that benefit from the availability of Internet access on public

transportation. The cost of deployment can be covered by additional services such as local advertisements and news contracts negotiated with appropriate channels.

- **Internet access “on the road or in flight”:** Inside their own cars, on public transportation, in airplanes, or aboard cruise ships, people represent a trapped audience that will pay a premium for access to content whether it is for work or entertainment.
- **First responders fleet:** This is another market segment that could benefit from bidirectional communications for applications such as video and database access. There is great interest in the integration of all assets that need to be leveraged in case of emergency. Recent press highlighted innovative communities deploying metro wireless infrastructures that could be used by the emergency responders. These new infrastructures lead to radio frequencies traditionally used for those communications to be freed up for other usage. Two notable initiatives are working on the future communications infrastructures for first responders: U-2010 (<http://www.u2010.eu/>) and MetroNet6 (<http://www.metronet6.org/>).
- **Cargo monitoring:** Tracking goods in transit is becoming more and more important to provide proper environmental conditions (maintaining temperature levels for perishable foods) and to constantly monitor valuable goods.

Cars, ships, trains, and airplanes have long-lasting power sources and have no major constraints related to the size of the communications devices they can be fitted with. This makes them ideal environments for mobile communications services. It is expected that vehicles will support multiple IP-connected devices, so they will require entire IP subnets to support them. They must also be able to connect seamlessly to various access network types such as wireless services. It should not be expected that a single access media type or access provider can cover all countries or regions or cities. The need for this type of flexibility also makes the case for the use of IP mobility.

It is rather difficult to evaluate the volume of addresses that would be used by networked vehicles but a recent study about the European market forecasts the numbers to be in the millions range. Table 2-3 provides a summary profile of the European road-based transportation.

Table 2-3 *European Market Size for Road Transportation^a*

Vehicle Category	Vehicle Type	Number of Vehicles	New Vehicles per Year	Vehicle Lifetime (Years)
Public				
Pro Vehicle	Police	200,000	40,000	5
Pro Vehicle	Ambulance Taxi	15,000	3,000	5
High End Vehicle	Bus	175,000	35,000	5
High End Vehicle	Fire (>16t)	32,000	7,000	5
High End Vehicle	Full Ambulance	20,000	4,000	5
Large Vehicle	Metro	20,000	700	30
Large Vehicle	Reg&Sub Rail	55,000	2,000	30
Large Vehicle	Light Rail	25,000	1,000	30
Private				
Pro Vehicle	Car	220,000,000	17,000,000	10+
Pro Vehicle	Goods Vehicles	20,000,000	4,000,000	5

a. Source: Internal Cisco Systems, Inc.

The 2006 data presented in Table 2-3 indicates that if an IPv4 /24 subnet is used per vehicle to interconnect its various sensors and communications devices, a deployment target of 5 percent of the European transportation market alone will require 183 /8 subnets.

The transportation market space is full of opportunities for new communications services. Cruise ships are fully networked and use services such as VoIP internally. Airplanes provide Internet access services, and multiple automakers are piloting networked cars. Table 2-3 indicates that the life cycle of a vehicle is generally long, between 5 and 30 years. Older OEM vehicles may never be updated. Others will be retrofitted with newer in-transit systems where there is business value such as safety, security, or attracting customers.

Industrial Sensors and Control Systems

Industrial networks (building, plant, and process automation networks) are migrating from legacy techniques to reliance on IP-based services, as shown in Figure 2-2. The drivers for change are economics, interoperability, simplification, and common cross-network security enforcement.




Figure 2-2 Evolution of Industrial Network Technology

The more sensors that are used in the manufacturing process and in tracking a product’s path through the distribution chain, the more optimizations can be identified and applied to each step of the process, as shown by the European Reconfigurable Ubiquitous Networked Embedded Systems (RUNES) project (<http://www.ist-runes.org>). Interconnecting sensors into a consolidated product management framework leads to significant productivity increases and cost reductions. They can also enhance security and management of fixed assets. Sensors can be deployed internally by enterprises, but we expect their footprint to grow with more and more sensors deployed in public domains, modes of transportation, and homes.

The migration of industrial sensors and control systems to an IP-based architecture is once again the result of several technologies:

- **Back-end and front-end control systems:** Applications running on computers and exchanging data through an IP network
- **Industrial sensors:** Span a wide range, from passive radio-frequency identification (RFID) with no IP address to Motes (small wireless transceiver attached to a sensor) or smart cards with an embedded IP stack
- **Readers or gateways:** Devices that collect data from sensors over specific wireless technologies; for example: IEEE 802.15.4 (low-rate wireless personal area network) with an embedded IP stack


To help the creation of an open and standardized architecture for sensor-enabled systems, the IETF IPv6 over Low power WPAN (6LOWPAN) working group⁹ leveraged IPv6 to solve challenges such as self-configuring networks, an aspect very typical to sensors' environments. Management and access of industrial sensors will be done both within the LAN and over the public domain, driving the need for IPv6 capabilities such as address space, "plug-and-play" autoconfiguration, communities of Interest, and so forth.

As shown in Figure 2-3, an estimated 127 million wireless sensors are expected to be deployed by 2010.¹⁰

At least 12 /8 prefixes are required to connect these devices. Wireless access facilitates the deployment of sensors and thus helps accelerate their adoption, which in turn increases the demand for IP addresses. IPv6 is perfectly suited for this market space. It has the necessary address space to cover a large number of devices and has the tools necessary to provide for simple provisioning of this type of devices, which generally have little processing power.

9. Source: IEEE 802.15 Task Group 4, <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/6lowpan-charter.html>.

10. <http://onworld.com/research/industrialwsn/vip/>.



Source: <http://onworld.com/research/industrialwsl/vip/>

Figure 2-3 *Number of Deployed Nodes (in Thousands)*

Common Observations When Looking at the Numbers

Interestingly, as soon as the depletion process of the IPv4 address space was slowed down through various conservation and management mechanisms, the immediate interest in its successor diminished. For the years that followed, the search for a reason to invest in an IP upgrade to IPv6 focused mainly on the application layer. The thorough scrubbing of IPv6-specific features and the brainstorming of IPv6 enthusiasts have yet to produce a killer application that would trigger market adoption. But, did we really make the most out of the last killer app we came up with, the Internet? The true potential of the Internet and of IP has yet to be unleashed, and this cannot happen in the context of its initial definition.

This chapter intends to show the technical arguments related to the new protocol. By looking at just a few statistics, we highlight the basic resource requirements for the continued growth of current markets. Some of the estimates presented here are backed by formal reports of address shortages. For example, the large cable providers in the United States reported running out of private IPv4 addresses in 2005.

Innovative applications that people will later call “killer apps” will certainly come with the IPv6 protocol. For now, however, just the basic market needs make a strong case for IPv6, which provides:

- **Resources to scale up current networks:** The larger address space is mandatory to meet current numbers of devices and to support the expected Internet population growth.
- **Resources to simplify network and service architecture:** Network and service design constraints due to address shortage can be eliminated, leading to reduced costs of operation.
- **An environment for continued innovation:** A larger and simpler Internet that integrates ever more diverse devices represents an environment that stimulates innovation, which in turn stimulates adoption.

IP: Today’s Constraints and Tomorrow’s Solutions

Despite 15 years’ worth of efforts to develop, implement, and deploy a new version of IP, “IPv6 lovers” and “IPv6 haters” still argue about what IPv6 can do and cannot do. This debate has resulted in many myths and rumors, which often are contradicted by facts and papers, such as “The Case for IPv6,” which was published as a draft RFC in 1999 (draft-ietf-iab-case-for-ipv6-06.txt). To offer a realistic and honest perspective on the benefits and challenges of the new protocol, this section addresses some of the common questions related to IPv6’s capabilities. The IPv6 myths must be debunked and its true strengths must be reiterated. This is a necessary step in understanding where the strengths and weaknesses of the technology stand.

Is IPv4 Running Out of Addresses?

One of the most intense debates related to IPv6 focuses on the prediction of the Internet’s doomsday, the day when we run out of IPv4 addresses. For the most

part, the networking community is in agreement that the IPv4 address space will be depleted. The question left unanswered is: When will this event occur?

NOTE Free IPv4 addresses will likely become extinct in an asymptotic fashion, so the criteria for total depletion will be more pragmatic in nature: When will the Regional Internet Registries (RIR) become incapable to service all address requests?

Much has been written about this question, but forecasts are not easy to make. By 2006, the two main predictions that emerged rely exclusively on different approaches to extrapolating historical IPv4 address allocation data:

Exhaustion of addresses by 2010: This prediction is based on an analysis by Tony Hain.¹¹

Exhaustion of addresses by 2012: This prediction is based on an analysis by Geoff Huston.¹²

NOTE Neither of these predictions took into consideration a very likely “last chance rush” on the registries. The concern is that as applicants for IPv4 addresses do not expect to have another chance to go back to the registries for future requests, they will not provide realistic justifications for their last request.

If the situation is dire, why aren’t people more concerned? This is likely the result of three factors. First, the value of an IP address is not market driven. If the value of an IP address were to grow with demand, people would take notice and would be able to calculate the cost versus the benefit of migrating to IPv6. Second,

11. For more information, see http://www.cisco.com/web/about/ac123/ac147/archived_issues/ipj_8-3/ipv4.html.

12. For more information, see <http://www.potaroo.net/tools/ipv4/>.

the Internet community “cried wolf” before and it turned out not to be an unsolvable problem. Third, because the Internet, like water and electricity, has become a utility service managed by others, users do not feel the need for strategic planning.

As discussed in the previous section, “Looking at the Numbers,” the IPv4 address space cannot sustain the Internet’s growth. For any long-term perspective, IPv6 becomes a natural choice. As with any limited resource, the IPv4 address space will be exhausted one day. IPv6 will pick up where IPv4 left off and it will plumb the Internet for a long period of time, accommodating a very large number of devices.

NOTE

Sixteen bytes or 128 bits can accommodate 340,282,366,920,938,463,463,374,607,431,768,211,456 IPv6 addresses, sufficient to keep engineers happy and to enchant trivia lovers with examples such as: There are enough IPv6 addresses for every proton in the Universe and 523 quadrillion addresses for each brain cell (number of cells per brain varies from person to person of course).

At the beginning of 2008, of the 255 possible /8 prefixes, more than 80 percent /8 IPv4 subnets were allocated to RIRs by IANA.¹³ In turn, each RIR allocates address space to its members, service providers, government agencies, and enterprises. Each organization uses a certain percentage of the full address space assigned to it.

Answer: Yes, IPv4 represents a finite resource that will get exhausted. In the context of the current allocation policies, predictions are converging to an IPv4 address space exhaustion date between 2010 and 2015. Whether it is 2010 or 2015, the date is rather near. Would you postpone an IP upgrade to find out which prediction is correct?

13. <http://www.iana.org/assignments/ipv4-address-space>.

Are NAT Benefits Lost by Moving to IPv6?

Network Address Translation (NAT) use is a worldwide reality. It is the front end to enterprise and home networks. NAT was developed to conserve IPv4 addresses. Without its widespread use, the Internet would certainly have already exhausted its address space.

The private address space definition (RFC 1918, *Address Allocation for Private Internets*) and its usage (RFC 3022, *Traditional IP Network Address Translator [Traditional NAT]*) have been documented in several papers. The NAT operation is simple and effective—one globally known IPv4 address on the Internet with millions of “private” IPv4 addresses available for internal use. The process obscures or hides the actual IP addresses of host computers in the NAT environment. It also makes communication with them more complicated when it is initiated from outside the NAT domain. This is one of the reasons why IPv6 supporters regularly denounce the “dark side” of NAT, referencing IETF documents such as RFC 2993, *Architectural Implications of NAT*, and RFC 3027, *Protocol Complications with the IP Network Address Translator*.

The acceptance of NAT in the '90s as a solution to IPv4 address exhaustion, far before the availability of any IPv6 product, has pushed Internet users to ignore the increased level of complexity, its trade-offs (and potential costs), and the impact on applications and connectivity. Users became comfortable with NAT, to the point where they assigned it more functionality than it actually provides. A common NAT-related misconception is that it enhances security. This is an important factor to consider when developing an IPv6 transition strategy, as nobody wants to lose NAT's perceived benefits. To address all user concerns related to networks without NAT, the IETF developed RFC 4846, *Local Network Protection for IPv6*, which provides guidelines and explanations of IPv6 features and configurations that match the perceived benefits of NAT.

Answer: Although NAT breaks the fundamental end-to-end model of the original Internet, it is not the goal of this book to argue about the pros and cons of NAT. It is far more important for organizations that are using NAT in their environments to understand that none of the real and perceived benefits of NAT are lost in IPv6.

Is IPv6 Improving Routing?

The evolutionary and not revolutionary nature of the new protocol is probably best exemplified in the case of its routing protocols. No new, dramatic concepts were introduced. The IPv4 routing protocols were, however, rebuilt in a cleaner way. RIPv2 led to RIPv3, OSPFv2 led to a similar but improved OSPFv3, and EIGRP, IS-IS, and BGP were extended to support IPv6.

The IPv6 routing protocols have no tricks to help alleviate the concerns about the size of the Internet routing tables. Considering the size of the Internet routing tables in Q1 2008 (+250,000 entries) and the lack of routing enhancements, some people argue that IPv6 is not good enough for a next generation protocol.

Answer: Although the scalability of the Internet is indeed a pressing problem and the subject of many research efforts, we need to remember that during its inception and development, IPv6 was built to solve the addressing problems and not the routing problems. These goals were set in IETF with the agreement of the engineering community. Although the plentiful address resources could lead to a cleaner Internet, IPv6 is not better or worse than IPv4 in terms of dealing with the Internet's scalability.

A new generation of routers, including edge routers such as Cisco ASR 1000 series, is designed for both IPv4 and IPv6 and can support gigabytes of memory, amounting to millions of routes. This means these routers can comfortably cope with the growth of the Internet routing tables. The real challenges, however, relate to the speed of convergence and the stability of the Internet. All of these are areas for future innovation.

Does IPv6 Support Multihomed Sites?

It is often stated that multihoming of sites is an IPv6 problem. Multihoming is not a protocol problem. In the case of IPv6, the challenges are due to a set of prefix allocation policies enforced by the RIRs.

Multihoming is widely used by enterprises for the following reasons:

- **Connect sites of a network with global reach:** Organizations with multinational infrastructures will connect to multiple service providers in different countries.

- **Backup for the link to the SP:** An enterprise can have several links into the same provider that protect each other in the event of a failure.
- **Backup SP:** An enterprise can connect to several SPs in order to protect against SP failure.

Multihoming is a problem for IP in general and not for IPv6 alone. IPv4 faces the same issues with multihoming as IPv6. Current multihoming techniques impact the size of the Internet routing table. In February 2008, there were more than 250,000 entries in the IPv4 backbone BGP routing table.¹⁴ The root cause of the problem is a lack of a good framework for prefix aggregation. IPv6 routing is based on the same protocols as IPv4, so all multihoming mechanisms available in IPv4 can be used in IPv6. The size of the IPv6 prefixes—which, within the Internet routing tables, is driven through prefix allocation policies—facilitates better address management and good aggregation.

Figure 2-4 is a summary of the IPv6 prefix allocation policies. The address space is managed by IANA, which allocates prefixes to the RIRs, which in turn allocate prefixes to ISPs on the provider dependent track or directly to organizations (enterprises, educational institutions, and so forth) on the Provider Independent track.




Figure 2-4 IPv6 Address Allocation Policies

14. <http://bgp.potaroo.net/index-bgp.html>.

A 2006 analysis of the IPv6 global routing tables, “Have We Reached 1000 Prefixes Yet? A Snapshot of the Global IPv6 Routing Table,” presents the effectiveness of the policy approach at that stage in the deployment of IPv6.¹⁵ Geoff Huston’s well-respected BGP Update site tracks and analyzes historic IPv4 and IPv6 BGP routing information, a valuable resource for up-to-date information.

These policies enforced by Registries preempt the use of multihoming as done in IPv4. In the absence of a multihoming mechanism that would work in the context of IPv6, enterprises are faced with significant operational challenges when integrating IPv6. Whenever an enterprise is dissatisfied with its provider and wants to switch to another one, it would have to renumber its network; and this is an expensive proposition. The provider-dependent allocation policies are not acceptable to enterprises.

To avoid a slowdown in IPv6 adoption due to these concerns, new policies were adopted by the RIRs and they provision for Provider Independent (PI) address space,¹⁶ which could be acquired directly from the RIR. These policies will help keep the IPv6 deployment momentum, but they do not solve the real problems of backbone routing table growth and organizations multihomed to several service providers. With a significantly larger address space, IPv6 can make the routing table problem considerably worse than it is in IPv4. The importance of this topic in the networking community mind is reflected in the support provided by IETF to research in this area. The list of suggestions and initiatives to solve the multihoming challenges was reported at the 53rd RIPE meeting and are

- **CIDR boundary:** The community decides on the longer prefix boundary that can be handled on the Internet.
- **Metro/regional:** IP address space is assigned to regions instead of organizations.
- **Community codes:** Prefixes are tagged with a BGP community attribute.
- **Published list of IPv6 blocks:** A list of prefixes approved for multihoming will be published, and filters will be opened for them.

15. <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-55/presentations/doering-ipv6-routing.pdf>.

16. http://www.arin.net/policy/archive/2005_1_orig.html.

- **Policy:** RIRs would implement policies that offer provider-independent address space. As of early 2008, all RIRs adopted a PI address space policy with the exception of RIPE (http://www.arin.net/policy/archive/2005_1_orig.html, <http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/afpol-v6200701.htm>, <http://lacnic.net/documentos/lacnicx/LAC-2006-08-en.pdf>, <http://www.apnic.net/meetings/12/docs/proposal-ipv6-ixp.html>).
- **IETF Multi6 WG:** This is the IETF working group that works on IPv6 multihoming solutions (<http://ops.ietf.org/multi6/>).
- **IETF Shim6 WG:** A shim layer that enables the decoupling between the IP address could be used by the application and used by transport (<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/shim6/>).
- **Global, Site, End-system (GSE):** Protocols that separate the user identifier from its locator.
- **Maximum prefix:** Each origin AS can advertise a limited number of prefixes.

Answer: The IPv6 protocol itself provides the same level of support for multihoming as IPv4 supports. Perceived challenges are just a reflection of address allocation policies implemented to enforce aggregation of prefixes in the Internet backbone routing table. IPv6 can leverage the same multihoming techniques as IPv4, and alternative mechanisms are being investigated in IETF.

Does IPv6 Deliver Plug-and-Play Autoconfiguration?

When mainframes and mini computers were the only devices running IP, autoconfiguration was not really an important feature, because devices were statically configured. With the proliferation of personal computers (PC), for scalable device management and reuse of resources, some dynamic autoconfiguration mechanisms became necessary. In IPv4, autoconfiguration relies on the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) (see RFC 4776), which is today extensively used in both enterprises and service provider environments.

NOTE The need and the benefit of a dynamic autoconfiguration mechanism was apparent to other networking protocols. For those who remember them, AppleTalk, IPX, or OSI ES-IS are now defunct networking protocols that had built-in autoprovisioning mechanisms. The users at the time, who were generally not networking proficient, were particularly fond of these features.

In RFC 1752, IPng specifically defined an acceptance technical criterion for the new protocol that focused on “configuration ease – The protocol must permit easy and largely distributed configuration and operation. Automatic configuration of hosts and routers is required.” Not only is automatic configuration seen as mandatory, but the need for simple configuration mechanisms is also highlighted. The need for simplicity becomes more and more important when considering the simpler devices that are now using IP. These devices might operate in environments where dependencies on a server may not be acceptable.

IPv6 took on the challenge posed by IPng. It offers plug-and-play autoconfiguration beyond the capabilities offered by IPv4 in the sense that a stateless (or serverless) address autoconfiguration mechanism was defined as part of the Neighbor Discovery protocol (RFC 2461, updated by RFC 4681). This capability is available in addition to DHCPv6 (RFC 4776), the stateful address autoconfiguration that is similar to IPv4 DHCP.

Nevertheless, real plug-and-play is more than just acquiring an IP address to access the network. For full operation, an IP device might need information the server addresses for applications such as Domain Name System (DNS), Network Time Protocol (NTP), and so forth. This is currently delivered with the help of “stateless” DHCPv6, a process similar to IPv4. Nevertheless, although servers might not be fully eliminated, IPv6 devices can fully provision themselves in a stateless manner. Microsoft has capitalized on IPv6 autoconfiguration with Windows Vista. The operating system supports a Peer Name Resolution Protocol (PNRP) for identifying and securely communicating with other “peer” computers on the network. Windows Meeting Space is a built-in Vista application for information sharing and conferencing.

In addition to these specific provisioning mechanisms, DHCPv6 has also been expanded to deliver entire IPv6 prefixes to a device rather than deliver just a

host address. This protocol extension, called DHCPv6 prefix delegation (RFC 3633), enables routers to autoconfigure their interfaces, a powerful tool that can be leveraged in broadband access networks to dynamically provision customer gateways.

Answer: It is true, IPv6 offers an enhanced plug-and-play autoconfiguration suite of protocols.

Does IPv6 Offer Better QoS?

Quality of service (QoS) in IP networks is delivered in the context of two architectures:

- **Differentiated Services (DiffServ):** Relies on each network element allocating resources to the forwarding of a packet based on a 6-bit classifier (differentiated code point) carried in the packet header
- **Integrated Services (IntServ):** Relies on the RSVP signaling protocol to set up resources along the path of packets with given transport requirements
- These architectural models are defined for both IPv4 and IPv6. IPv4 and IPv6 main headers include the same 8-bit field used for DiffServ, although they are named differently: Type of Service (ToS) in IPv4 versus Traffic Class in IPv6. IntServ for IPv6 requires an IPv6 implementation of RSVP.

Conceptually, QoS relates to applications. For example, to guarantee high quality for phone calls established over IP, VoIP packets get higher priority compared to other traffic types. This means that QoS policies should be independent of IP version and should depend exclusively on application types. Thus, in a dual-stack network, the same priority is assigned to the packets of a given application independent of the IP version it runs over. However, for those very specific conditions that require one IP version to be privileged over the other, it is possible to assign different priorities based on IP version.

Why do we read in some publication that IPv6 offers better QoS than IPv4? This is mainly driven by the presence of a 20-bit field named Flow Label in the main IPv6 header, a field that does not exist in IPv4. The Flow Label field, as

specified in RFC 2460 and RFC 3697, is used by a source to label packets of the same flow. Its definition guarantees that the information carried has an end-to-end meaning; its value cannot be modified by intermediate systems. Although some interesting proposals do exist for the use of the Flow Label field, the field is currently unused and may not have practical value in the overall Internet where no definition of Flow Label value has been published or agreed upon by service providers. Nevertheless, these 20 bits in the main IP header are very precious real estate, so forms of Flow Label usage will surely be developed in the future.

Answer: IPv6 QoS is neither better nor worse than IPv4 QoS. It follows the same architectural models and faces the same inherent challenges. At this point in time, the presence of the 20-bit Flow Label field in the IPv6 header is not enough to justify the claim of better QoS.

Is IPv6 Required for Mobility?

Before addressing the topic, it is important to clarify what “mobility” really means for a given environment. Over the past few years, mobility became a “fashionable” term used in many marketing presentations. Nevertheless, it is not always related to IP. So, let’s start with a few definitions:

- **Mobile client:** A mobile client is a device such as a laptop, PDA, smartphone, iPod, or sensor that regularly changes location but does not necessarily have its own network interface. For example, an Apple iPod will connect through a PC to download contents.
- **Mobile application:** An application that runs on a mobile device is a mobile application. Popular audio or video contents (for example, podcasts) consist of files that are downloaded to mobile devices and used later with no need for Internet connectivity. (By contrast, VoIP is an example of an application that requires the mobile client to be always connected.)
- **Wireless technologies:** They enable mobile devices and applications to be used in any covered location. There are licensed-band (3G/GPRS/Edge/EVDO/WiMAX/LTE) and unlicensed-band (Wi-Fi) technologies.

- **Layer 2 mobility:** A device moving within a single Layer 2 domain, such as the area covered by a single Wi-Fi access point, has Layer 2 mobility.
- **Layer 3 mobility:** Also called IP Mobility, Layer 3 mobility addresses the case of a mobile device moving between multiple Layer 3 domains while keeping the same IP address. This capability supports persistency and transparency at the application level.
- **Layer 7 mobility:** A specific application with Layer 7 mobility may survive network reconfigurations and potentially address changes but with service interruption. An example of such an application is the Instant Messaging.
- **Mobile networks:** In a mobile network, mobility is provided simultaneously to a group of devices. The router providing network access to the devices moves across Layer 3 domains. The changes in the point of attachment for the router uplink have no effect on the interfaces that provide access to devices connected to the router.
- **Ad hoc networking:** This Layer 3 mobility feature set developed in the IETF under the MANET and Mobility EXTensions for IPv6 (MEXT) working groups enables mobile routers to self-organize their ad hoc connections with peers.

The mobility features relevant to an IP discussion are: Layer 3 mobility, mobile networks, and ad hoc networking. IP Mobility is generally synonymous with the IETF protocol suite called Mobile IP (MIP) that has been standardized for both IPv4 and IPv6. When considering the potential scope of deployment for MIP—for example, handheld devices compliant with standards from 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) and 3GPP2—it becomes evident that we are dealing with millions of mobile devices. This type of environment requires the large address space provided by IPv6. 3GPP has also addressed the delivery of converged voice, data, and video to mobile devices through the IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) standard. IMS requires IPv6 support, to ensure that each mobile phone is individually addressable with a persistent address for full bidirectional services.

There is more to MIPv6 than just the support of large-scale deployments. Mobile IPv6 leverages the IPv6 extension headers that are inherent to the protocol.

This makes IP mobility an integrated feature of the IPv6 protocol as required by RFC 1752 and enables it to easily add capabilities such as path optimization between mobile nodes and their communication peer.

Answer: No, IPv6 is not required for mobility. However, Layer 3 mobility, also named IP mobility, is integrated in the protocol rather than being an add-on, as in the case of IPv4. The market is developing new business models, new communities of interest, and new products based on standardized protocols like Mobile IPv6 (MIPv6) and Networks Mobility (NEMO). This will make mobility easier to deploy and capable of supporting a much larger number of more full-featured handsets and other new devices supporting multi-mode wireless radio, video, and VoIP. The use of IMS and other higher-level standards requiring IPv6 support will offer a platform for new marketable products and services not possible with IPv4.

Does IPv6 Provide Increased Security?

Today, security is certainly one of the biggest challenges faced by network managers. Any enhancement to security is always welcomed by operational teams. When reading that “IPv6 is more secure than IPv4,” it is natural to become more interested in the new protocol. In fact, several past business cases have had as a supporting argument the increased security of IPv6. So, is IPv6 more secure than IPv4 or is it just a misunderstanding turned into an IPv6 marketing pitch?

The source of the enhanced IPv6 security claims can be traced back to the original version of the IPv6 specifications (RFC 1883), which states under “Security Considerations”: “This document specifies that the IP Authentication Header [RFC-1826] and the IP Encapsulating Security Payload [RFC-1827] be used with IPv6, in conformance with the Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol [RFC-1825].”¹⁷

In an environment that eliminates the NAT gateway that manipulates a packet’s payload, the use of AH and ESP headers might be perceived as a new security paradigm. End-to-end security is implemented based on IPsec with no intermediate devices manipulating the data. IPsec is becoming the de facto mechanism to protect IPv6 routing protocols such as OSPFv3.

17. <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1883.txt>.

In reality, IPv6 IPsec is not different from IPv4 IPsec. It offers the same level of protection and requires a key distribution infrastructure to be in place for full operation. With no universal key distribution mechanism available Internet wide, this architecture has no practical value for the overall Internet but it could meet the requirements for networks under a single management entity. It is also important to note that some devices might not be capable of doing encryption in a cost-effective way. Also, some features used in IPv4 (for example, WAN optimization) will not be possible if packet manipulation is not allowed. These devices and services would have to be excluded from an environment where end-to-end IPsec between nodes is the rule.

More importantly, communications security must be viewed holistically, at all layers of the OSI model. Different mechanisms and tools are deployed to secure each layer. For example, IEEE 802.1X is configured to protect an IEEE 802.11 infrastructure providing authentication mechanisms at Layer 2. At the same time, antivirus and antispam software protects the application layer.

NOTE The most number of security threats, and the most damaging ones, target the layers above IP.

Based on the accumulated experience securing IPv4 networks, it would be extremely dangerous to narrow network security to IP and IPsec only. Such a strategy would lead to a world in which hosts exchange viruses in a very secure manner. When looking at Layer 3, however, it is true that IPv6 brings along new perspectives. IPv6 makes some things better but has the potential to make other things worse. We cannot state that the net sum makes IPv6 a more or a less secure protocol:

- **Better:** In IPv6, automated scanning and worm propagation is harder due to huge subnets. With a uniform and non-obvious distribution of host IDs, it is practically impossible for an attacker to perform successful reconnaissance.

- **Challenging:** New concepts in addressing and configuration and lack of familiarity with the technology can lead to incomplete or incorrectly applied security policies. When managing a dual-stack environment, potential vulnerabilities exist because both IPv4 and IPv6 need to be properly secured. Extension headers might open the door to new types of threats.
- **Different:** IPv4 Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) is replaced by IPv6 Neighbor Discovery (ND), both of which are unsecured by default. Unlike IPv4, IPv6 has a Secure Neighbor Discovery (SEND) protocol (RFC 3971), which improves security for ND.

NOTE The IPv4 security tools and features might not yet be available for IPv6, which exposes networks in the transitional phase.

Answer: No, IPv6 is not more secure than IPv4 as a protocol set. Most of the security challenges faced by IPv4 remain in IPv6 environments. Network managers must control the IPv6 traffic as they do for IPv4. IPsec can be leveraged to secure IPv6 environments when possible but a global network of IPsec peer-to-peer communication is far from becoming reality, if such a reality is ever possible or desired.

Is Renumbering Easier with IPv6?

Renumbering a network, assigning it a new addressing scheme, is a task dreaded by network managers. Renumbering, however, is a fact of life in the evolution of a business and is triggered by factors such as:

- Growth
- Acquisitions
- Large mergers
- Site transition

Although it is true that IPv6 autoconfiguration mechanisms help in the renumbering process, it is incorrect to state that IPv6 solved the renumbering problem. The actual change of IP addresses on the interfaces of hosts, routers, switches, and appliances represents only one step of the renumbering process. Other updates are generally required in order to restore full network operation:

- **IP address–dependent feature configuration:** Examples of such features are access control list (ACL) and addressing of resources such as AAA servers and network management servers.
- **Naming server:** All DNS entries must be updated to reflect the new address corresponding to a given name.
- **Network management applications:** All tools used to monitor the network must be updated.

To fully appreciate the implications of renumbering an IPv6 network, refer to RFC 4192, *Procedures for Renumbering an IPv6 Network Without a Flag Day*,¹⁸ which documents a study done over the life of the European Commission–funded 6NET project in collaboration with Cisco Systems on this topic.

Answer: Renumbering is somewhat easier in IPv6; however, not all its aspects are simplified. The best recommendation is for organizations to use naming services, such as DNS, to the extent practical to minimize the impact of renumbering both in IPv4 and IPv6.

Summary

The key takeaway of this chapter is that IPv6 represents an evolution of IP, not a revolution. Its development reflects the lessons learned from IPv4 and the requirements of today’s Internet. The primary benefit comes from increased resources, not from radical protocol changes, as sometimes claimed. The original design goals of the new protocol were also very specific about enabling a smooth transition over the years and facilitating a long-term coexistence of IPv4 and IPv6.

18. <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4192.txt>.

The commonly asked questions related to IPv6 that were answered in this chapter are summarized in Table 2-4. They provide a realistic perspective on the protocol.

Table 2-4 *Summary of Commonly Asked IPv6 Questions*

Question	Answer
Is IPv4 running out of addresses?	Yes. Current estimates indicate this will occur between 2010 and 2012.
Are NAT benefits lost when moving to IPv6?	No. Even though NAT is not available, its true or perceived benefits can be implemented in IPv6.
Is IPv6 improving routing?	No. Routing protocols for IPv6 are equivalent to their IPv4 counterparts.
Will the size of the Internet routing table be a problem for networking equipment?	No. New generations of routers can handle the growth of the Internet routing tables.
Does IPv6 support multihomed sites?	Yes. At protocol level, IPv6 can implement multihoming in the same way as IPv4. Challenges might be due to allocation policies.
Does IPv6 deliver plug-and-play autoconfiguration?	Yes. IPv6 offers unique autoconfiguration mechanisms.
Does IPv6 offer better QoS?	No. At this time, the IPv6 and IPv4 QoS implementations are similar.
Is IPv6 required for mobility?	No. However, IPv6 does implement improvements to the Mobile IP protocols.
Does IPv6 provide increased security?	No. Most security threats and mitigation policies are similar to IPv4.
Is renumbering easier with IPv6?	Yes. Some IPv6 features simplify renumbering; however, they do not address all aspects of renumbering.

As discussed, the IPv4 address space cannot sustain the growing number of Internet users and the many new ways in which the Internet is facilitating today's communications. This evolution was not envisioned by the initial developers of the TCP/IP protocol suite. The only real option to address the growth pressures faced by IP is IPv6, and the case for its adoption is made in this chapter. Although IPv6, similar to IPv4, is a live and evolving protocol, it has already reached the level of maturity needed for safe, large-scale deployments. In recognition of a need for IPv6, organizations worldwide are already deploying it or aggressively planning its deployment.

Index

Numerics

- 3GPP (3rd Generation Partnership Project), 47, 120, 218, 360
- 6bone, 392
 - infrastructure, 127
 - project, 180
- 6Bone Backbone Routing Guidelines, 176
- 6DEPLOY project, 385
- 6DISS project, 111, 115, 385
- 6INIT, 115
- 6journal, 389
- 6LOWPAN (IPv6 over Low power WPAN), 34, 126, 133
- 6NET, 111, 115, 127, 392
- 6NGIX, 115
- 6th Framework Program of the European Union, 385

A

- AAA services, 239
- ABC (Always Best Connected), 76
- acceptance policies, 380
- access
 - Cisco Systems, 284
 - direct access to devices, 67
 - fixed-mobile convergence, 77
 - ICT spending and, 61
 - wireless, 250

- ACLs (access control lists), 51, 124
- Acquisition Management System (AMS), 271
- action, 331
 - based on product assessment, 375
- actuators, 75
- ad hoc networks, 47
- addresses, 250
 - constraints, 237
 - depletion, IPv4, 400
 - exhaustion of, 37
 - history of IPv6 standardization, 19–23
 - IP, Bechtel Corporation, 295
 - lifetime, 222
 - adjustments*, 172
 - Cisco Systems*, 283
 - Command Information*, 341
 - U.S. government*, 263
 - management, 157, 250
 - planning, 387
 - renumbering, 50–51
 - schemes, 272, 283
 - space
 - Bouygues Telecom*, 223
 - exhaustion*, 19
 - scalability*, 172
 - sizing*, 354
 - Tata Communications*, 195
 - types, 209, 222, 263, 283, 341

adoption

- costs, 140
- education, 388–394
- perspective, 400–402
- strategies
 - challenges, 138–142*
 - government-sponsored, 105–114*
 - mandates, 94–105*
 - national, 90–94*
 - national research environments and projects, 114–117*
- Advanced Incident Response System (AIRS), 329**
- Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), 56**
- Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) program, 271**
- Africa, 385**
- AIRS (Advanced Incident Response System), 329**
- ALG (Application Layer Gateway), 399**
- alignment with strategic objectives, 363–364**
- allocation**
 - IP addresses, 295
 - IPv6, 100
 - prefixes, 40–43, 97
 - RIRs, 99
- Always Best Connected (ABC), 76**
- Amazon.com, effect of network outages, 8**
- American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN), 92**
- AMS (Acquisition Management System), 271**
- AMS-IX, 181**
- analysis of business cases, 148–152**
 - enterprises
 - Arch Rock, 324–335*
 - Bechtel Corporation, 291–324*
 - Cisco Systems, 277–290*

- Command Information, 336–356*
- Factice World Bank, 244–256*
- government agencies (early adopters), 257–277*
- Greek school network, 229–244*
- gap analysis, 226
- service providers, 152
 - Bouygues Telecom, 216–229*
 - Comcast, 153–165*
 - Nextel, 166–186*
 - SAVVIS, 204–216*
 - Tata Communications, 187–203*
- Andrijcic, Eva, 9**
- annunciators, 75**
- APNIC (RIR for Asia Pacific), 99**
- Apple, conformance tests, 128**
- Application Layer Gateway (ALG), 399**
- applications, 224**
 - adoption perspective, 400–401
 - assessing, 371
 - Cisco Unified Communications, 250
 - code, 136
 - dependency, 274
 - deployment, 365
 - effect of migration on, 359
 - Factice World bank, 249
 - ICT spending and, 61
 - IDEs, 136
 - Japan, 109
 - mobile services, 218
 - OA (office automation), 359
 - operating system integration, 128
 - peer to peer, enabling, 237
 - protocols, 137
 - push technologies, 225
 - references, 390
 - SaaS, 209
 - sensors, 330
 - transition existing, 268
 - vendors, 269

application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs), 124

Arch Rock, 133

- case for IPv6, 331–333
- case study, 324–335
- company profile, 328–329
- lessons learned, 334–335
- network profile, 329–331

architecture

- enterprise, 366
- QoS, 45–46
- SOA, 360

ARIN (American Registry for Internet Numbers), 92

ARPA (Advanced Research Projects Agency), 56

ARPANET, 56

Asahikawa, 107

ASC (Advanced Simulation and Computing) program, 271

Asia, 385

ASICs (application-specific integrated circuits), 124

Asimov, Isaac, 402

assessment

- IT environments, 371–375
- products, 373–374
- training, 386

Assistant Secretary of Defense, 94

AT&T, 129

ATM (automated teller machines), 252

Australia, ICT strategies, 117

authentication, 224

autoconfiguration, 29

- plug and play, 43–45
- renumbering, 51

automated teller machines (ATM), 252

automation, 331

- convergence to IP, industrial, 302
- OA, 359

availability

- content policies, defining, 381
- of products, 140
- products, 203

awareness of technology, 244

B

B2B (business-to-business) connections, 80

back-end

- control systems, 34
- support, 162

backups, multihoming, 41

backward compatibility, 268

banking, Internet, 252

Barcelona, Spain, 386

Bechtel Corporation, 362–363

- case for IPv6, 300–307
- case study, 291–324
- company profile, 291–292
- infrastructure, 294–298
- lessons learned, 320–324
- network profile, 292–294
- next generation infrastructure, 365
- perspective on IPv6, 298–300
- planning and implementation, 308–317
- teams, 318–320

behavior at scale, 177

benefits of IPv6, 18–36

billing systems, 224

BoF (Birds of a Feather), 20

Bouygues Telecom

- case for IPv6, 224
- case study, 216–229
- company profile, 220–221
- infrastructure, 222–223
- lessons learned, 228–229
- network profile, 221–222
- perspective on IPv6, 223–224
- planning, 225–227

broad competence, 303
broad involvement, 321
broad spectrums, selecting, 149
broadband
 access provider, Comcast case study, 153–165
 penetration, 79
Brynjolfsson, E., 58
budget cycles, 368
business and engineering
 perspectives, combining, 149
business case for IPv6, 18–36
business, demand for information, 74
business functions, 360
business Internet connections, dependence on, 8
business perspective of IP evolution, 71–82
business strategies, 117–119
 customer service, 127–130
 following other companies, 134–138
 infrastructure platforms, creating, 122–127
 leadership, establishing through innovation, 132–134
 leadership, establishing through services, 130–131
 standards, defining, 119–122
business-to-business (B2B) connections, 80

C

cable modem termination systems (CMTSs), 161
Cable Television Laboratories, Inc., 121
cable TV, 155. See also Comcast Corporation
CableLabs, 360
capabilities for project execution, 302
CAPEX (capital expenditure), 24
capital expenditure (CAPEX), 24

cargo, monitoring, 31
case for IPv6
 Arch Rock, 331–333
 Bechtel Corporation, 300–307
 Bouygues Telecom, 224
 Cisco Systems, 287–288
 Comcast, 158–160
 Command Information, 346–348
 Factice World Bank, 253–254
 Greek School Network, 237–239
 Nextel, 174–179
 SAVVIS, 211–212
 Tata Communications, 196–197
 U.S. government, 266–267
case studies, 148–152
 enterprises, 229
 Arch Rock, 324–335
 Bechtel Corporation, 291–324
 Cisco Systems, 277–290
 Command Information, 336–356
 Factice World Bank, 244–256
 government agencies (early adopters), 257–277
 Greek school network, 229–244
 service providers, 152
 Bouygues Telecom, 216–229
 Comcast, 153–165
 Nextel, 166–186
 SAVVIS, 204–216
 Tata Communications, 187–203
CATNIP (Common Architecture for the Internet), 21
CDG (CDMA Development Group), 120
CDMA Development Group (CDG), 120
cell phones, 76
cellular industry standards, 120
Cerasi, Eivan, 271
CERNET, 112
CERNET-2, 116

- certification cycles, 368**
- change management, 322**
- China**
 - government-sponsored adoption strategies, 112
 - ICT spending in, 60
 - research, 116
- China Mobile, 112**
- China Netcom/CSTNET, 112**
- China Next Generation Internet (CNGI), 112**
- China RailCom, 112**
- China Telecom, 112**
- China Unicom, 112**
- CIDR (Classless Interdomain Routing), 20**
- Cisco Academy, 386**
- Cisco Networkers, 386**
- Cisco Systems**
 - case for IPv6, 287–288
 - case study, 277–290
 - company profile, 279–281
 - infrastructure, 282–284
 - IT profile, 281–282
 - lessons learned, 290
 - perspective on IPv6, 285–287
 - planning and implementation, 288–289
- Cisco Unified Communications, 250**
- Classless Interdomain Routing (CIDR), 20**
- CLNP (Connectionless Network Protocol), 20**
- closed environments, 148**
- CMTSs (cable modem termination systems), 161**
- CNAT (Comprehensive Network Address Translator), 21**
- CNGI (China Next Generation Internet), 112**
- code, applications, 136**
- collaboration, on-demand, 364**
- Comcast Corporation, 85, 362**
 - case for IPv6, 158–160
 - case study, 153–165
 - company profile, 154–155
 - infrastructure, 156–157
 - management, 81*
 - scaling at, 131*
 - lessons learned, 165
 - network profile, 155–156
 - perspective on IPv6, 157–158
 - planning and implementation, 160–164
- Command Information**
 - case for IPv6, 346–348
 - case study, 336–356
 - company profile, 338–340
 - infrastructure, 341–342
 - IT profile, 340–341
 - lessons learned, 353–354
 - perspective on IPv6, 342–345
 - planning and implementation, 349–353
- commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) products, 207**
- Common Architecture for the Internet (CATNIP), 21**
- communications**
 - Bechtel Corporation, 321
 - convergence of IP-based, 73
 - frequency of, 376
 - ICT spending, 59
 - technologies deployment, 117
- company profiles, 151**
 - Arch Rock, 328–329
 - Bechtel Corporation, 291–292
 - Bouygues Telecom, 220–221
 - Cisco Systems, 279–281
 - Comcast, 154–155
 - Command Information, 338–340
 - Factice World Bank, 247
 - Nextel, 167–169
 - SAVVIS, 205–206
 - Tata Communications, 189–191
 - U.S. government, 260–261

- compatibility, 142, 268**
 - with corporate information systems, 274
- competence, 303**
- competition, distancing from future, 346**
- competitive edge, gaining, 81–82**
- compile-time flag IPV6STRICT, 136**
- complementary approach, Bechtel Corporation, 324**
- compliance, 101, 127**
 - cost of, 375
 - entrance and acceptance policies, 380
 - standards, 389–390
- Comprehensive Network Address Translator (CNAT), 21**
- computing software platforms, 123**
- conferencing, 131**
- configuration**
 - adoption strategies, 90
 - challenges, 138–142*
 - government-sponsored, 105–114*
 - mandates, 94–105*
 - national, 90–94*
 - national research environments and projects, 114–117*
 - autoconfiguration, 29
 - management, 360
 - quality assurance, 135*
 - plug and play autoconfiguration, 43–45
- conformance tests, 128**
- Connectionless Network Protocol (CLNP), 20**
- connections**
 - B2B, 80
 - fleet connectivity, 30
 - GSM, 27
 - project goals, 365
 - requirements, 210
- consistency, 212**
 - of protocols, 105
- constraints, 36–51**
 - addresses, 209, 237
- consulting, 179**
 - Command Information, 349
- consumer, 29**
- content**
 - availability policies, defining, 381
 - distribution, 179
- control, 331**
- control systems, 33–34**
- converged regional-area networks (CRANs), 84, 155**
- convergence**
 - engineering, 364
 - fixed-mobile, 76
 - FMC, 219
 - intranets, 251
 - of IP-based communications, 73
- core teams, 318**
- core, deployment in, 162**
- costs**
 - of adoption, 140
 - of Bechtel Corporation projects, 323
 - of deployment, 215
 - of downtime, 8,10
 - of integration, 272
 - management, 307
 - of compliance, 375
 - of IP evolution, 82–86
 - ROI, 257
 - Tata Communications, 202
- COTS (commercial off-the-shelf) products, 207, 269**
- CRANs (converged regional-area networks), 84, 155**
- cross-functional coordination, 376**
- Culler, David E., 326, 329**
- Curran, John, 92**
- customers**
 - preparation for, 176
 - requirements, 301
 - service, 127–130

D**Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification (DOCSIS), 121****data services, 168**

Tata Communications, 191

Dearborn, Rob, 8**dedicated routers, 181****Dedicated Short-Range****Communications (DSRC) project, 267****Deering, Steve, 398****default, enabling IPv6 by, 365****Defense Research and Engineering Network (DREN), 96****defining**migration objectives, 362–370
standards, 119–122**demand**for information, 74–75
for IPv6, 215**demilitarized zones (DMZs), 342****Department of Commerce (DoC), 100****Department of Defense (DoD), 94****dependence, Internet****dependency**applications, 274
Internet, 7–12**depletion**of IPv4 addresses, 400
of numbers, 35**Deploying IPv6 Networks, 151****deployment**applications, 365
Bechtel Corporation, 306
timeline, 316
strategies, 227
Cisco Systems strategies, 289
Comcast strategy for, 163
communications technologies, 117
costs, 215
deployed nodes, number of, 34
documentation, 392–393
Greek School Network strategies, 241

incrementation, 212

Japan, 108

Nextel, 181

project scope, 366

SAVVIS strategies, 214

schedules, 272

services, 365

upgrading, correlating processes, 243

Deutsche Telekom AG, 99, 112**development**

Command Information strategies, 349

IDEs, 136

policies, updating, 380

projects, 370

devices, 29

assessing, 371

direct access to, 67

integration, 365

in Japan, 109

management, 153

plug and play autoconfiguration, 43–45

voice, 284

DHCPv6 prefix delegation (RFC 3633), 45**Diet (Japanese Parliament), 106****Differentiated Services. See DiffServ differentiators, 196, 354****DiffServ (Differentiated Services), 45****Digital Planet 2006***The Global Information Economy, 58***Digital Video over IP (DVoIP), 131****direct access to devices, 67****directory services, 239****DISA (DoD Defense Information Systems Agency) Center for Engineering, 96****disruptions, minimizing, 212****distribution**

content, 179

innovation, 4

DMZs (demilitarized zones), 342

DNS (Domain Name System), 9, 44, 124
DoC (Department of Commerce), 100
DOCSIS (Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification), 121, 161
documentation, deployment, 392–393
DoD (Department of Defense), 94
DoD Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Center for Engineering, 96
DoE (U.S. Department of Energy), 102
Domain Name System. *See* DNS
domains, training, 384
downtime, cost of, 10
DREN (Defense Research and Engineering Network), 96
drivers, IPv6, 353
DSRC (Dedicated Short-Range Communications) project, 267
dual-stack services, 273
Durand, Alain, 164
DvoIP (Digital Video over IP), 131
dynamic intellectual property, 364
Dynes, Scott, 9

E

early adoption, Tata Communications, 202
early planning, 215
earth population versus Internet users, 24–27
Eastern Europe, 385
Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 57
economies of scale, 12–13, 67
economy of IP evolution
 business perspective of, 71–82
 cost of, 82–86
 enabling education, 69–71
 ICT impact on productivity, 58–61
 local industry development, 68–69
 stimulating innovation, 66–68
 WSIS, 62–65
EDGE (Enhanced Data rates for GSM Evolution), 120

education, 11, 137
 adoption, 388–394
 demand for information, 74
 enabling, 69–71
 Greek school network case study, 229–244
 technology, 104, 383–387
 resources, 385–386
Educational Testing Service (ETS), 69
e-Europe policy, 111
effectors, 75
efficiency, 3
e-Infrastructure environments, 385
e-Japan strategy adoption, 107
Eldridge, John M., 148, 272
e-learning, 70
e-mail, Greek School Network, 239
Embedded RP (multicast routing rendezvous point), 131
enabling
 education, 69–71
 existing services, 179
 peer to peer applications, 237
 services, 241
end-to-end security, 223
Energy Sciences Network (ESnet), 265
enforcement of project goals, 376
engineer perspectives, combining, 149
engineering
 Bechtel Corporation case study, 291–324
 convergence, 364
Enhanced Data rates for GSM Evolution (EDGE), 120
enterprise architecture, 366
enterprise case studies
 Arch Rock, 324–335
 Bechtel Corporation, 291–324
 Cisco Systems, 277–290
 Command Information, 336–356
 Factice World Bank, 244–256
 government agencies (early adopters), 257–277
 Greek school network, 229–244

enterprise networks, 79
entertainment, 74
entrance policies, 380
environments
 monitoring, 331
 policies, 11
 testing, 273
equipment
 project timelines, 368
 reuse, 181
 support, 268, 274
Ericsson Research, 76
Esnet (Energy Sciences Network), 265
Estrin, Deborah, 326
ETS (Educational Testing Service), 69
ETSI (European Telecommunications Standards Institute), 91
EU (European Union)
 government-sponsored adoption strategies, 111
 research, 115
Euro6IX, 115
EUROCONTROL Network Sub-Domain project, 261
Europe, 385
European 6DISS project, 385
European IPv6 Task Force, 389
European Reconfigurable Ubiquitous Networked Embedded Systems (RUNES) project, 33, 391
European Regional Registry, 99
European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), 91
European U-2010, 391
European Union. See EU
Evans, Karen, 101
events, logging, 222
evolution
 constant technology, 364
 of ATM services, 252
 of IP
 adoption perspective, 400–402
 evolutionary perspective, 398–400
 futuristic perspective, 402–403

evolvability, 95
execution, project policies, 381–383
exhaustion of addresses, 37
existing services, enabling, 179
expanding routing tables, 19
extensibility, protocols, 67

F

FAA (Federal Aviation Administration), 261
facilitating IP environments, 78–80
facilities management, 132
fact-based decisions, 321
Factice World Bank
 case for IPv6, 253–254
 case study, 244–256
 company profile, 247
 infrastructure, 249–251
 IT profile, 248–249
 lessons learned, 255–256
 perspective on IPv6, 251–253
 planning and implementation, 254–255
failures, Bechtel Corporation, 323
FAS (Federal Acquisition Service), 101
fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD), 322
feature monitoring, 226
Federal Acquisition Service (FAS), 101
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), 261
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1938, 258
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, 258
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, 258
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, 258
Fellows, David, 158
fiber to the home (FTTH) cable, 28, 153
Field, Brian, 84
fields, Flow Label, 45
financial market consolidation and expansion, 251

financial opportunities of IPv6, 401
first responder communication, 31
fixed IPv6-enabled gateways, 126
Fixed Mobile Convergence (FMC),
 178, 219
fixed-mobile convergence, 76
flags, IPV6STRICT, 136
fleet connectivity, 30
Flow Label field, 45
FMC (Fixed Mobile Convergence),
 178, 219
forward compatibility, 268
FP7 projects, 385
France, ICT spending in, 60
France Telecom, 99, 112
Free, 128
FreeFit for Lighting Controller, 132
front-end control systems, 34
FTTH (fiber to the home) cable, 28,
 153
FUD (fear, uncertainty, and doubt),
 322
functions
 business, 360
 getaddrinfo(), 136
 gethostbyname(), 136
future solutions, 36–51
futuristic perspective, 402–403

G

gaining competitive edge and
 leaderships, 81–82
Galactic Network, 56
Galleria v6, 109
gap analysis, 226
gatekeepers, leverage of, 137
gateways, 34
GDP (gross domestic product), 60
 ICT contribution to, 91
 India, 113
GEANT, 115
General Packet Radio Service
 (GPRS), 120, 220

generic routing encapsulation (GRE)
 tunnels, 175
Geneva 2003, 63
GENI project, 400
George, Wesley, 167
geostationary satellites, 191
getaddrinfo() function, 136
gethostbyname() function, 136
GGSN (GPRS Support Node), 224
GIG (Global Information Grid), 95,
 301
GIO (Global Infrastructure
 Operations), 318
global economy
 Internet impact on, 57
 presence, 11
Global Information Grid (GIG), 95,
 301
Global Infrastructure Operations
 (GIO), 318
global IPv4 address management,
 250, 283
 Command Information, 342
global perspectives, presenting, 149
Global Positioning System. *See* GPS
global reachability, 29
Global Support Organization (GSO),
 319
global synchronization, 92
Global System for Mobile (GSM), 27,
 120
Global Systems Engineering (GSE),
 318
Global, Site, End-system (GSE), 43
Globus Toolkit, 391
GMPLS, 169
Go4IT project, 111, 115
Go6, 389
goals, projects, 365–366, 376
GOSIP (Government Open Systems
 Interconnect Profile), 20
governance, 360, 375–383
government agencies, case study,
 257–277
government mandates, 93, 401

Government Open Systems

Interconnect Profile (GOSIP), 20

government support of IP

development, 11

government-sponsored adoption

strategies, 105–114

GPRS (General Packet Radio

Service), 120, 220

GPRS Support Node (GGSN), 224

GPS (Global Positioning System), 29

GRE (generic routing encapsulation)

tunnels, 175

Greek Research and Technology

Network (GRNET), 232

Greek School Network

case for IPv6, 237–239

case study, 229–244

infrastructure, 236

lessons learned, 242–244

network profile, 233–235

organization profile, 232–233

perspective on IPv6, 236–237

planning and implementation,

239–242

Green, David B., 275

greenfield environments, 68, 74

GRNET (Greek Research and

Technology Network), 232

gross domestic product (GDP)

ICT contribution to, 91

India, 113

Grossetete, Patrick, 151

growth

of Internet, 23–36

of IP infrastructures, 12–13

GSA (U.S. General Services

Administration), 101

GSE (Global Systems Engineering),

318

GSE (Global, Site, End-system), 43

GSM (Global System for Mobile), 27,

120

GSO (Global Support Organization),

319

guidelines

addressing and routing, 20

NIST, 272

H

Hain, Tony, 37

handover, seamless, 219

hardware

computing platforms, 123

ICT spending, 59

U.S. government, 273

HD (Host-Density) ratio, 26

HDTV (high-definition TV)

programming, 105

health-care information, 3

high densities of subscribers, 218

high-definition TV (HDTV)

programming, 105

history of IPv6 standardization,

19–23

hobbies, pursuing, 3

Hoffmann, Lionel, 220

Hokkaido, 107

holographic telepresence, 402

home Internet connections,

dependence on, 7

Hong, Wei, 328

Host-Density (HD) ratio, 26

hosts, assessing, 371

House Committee on Government

Reform, 257

HP OpenView TeMIP Fault

Management, 222

Hu, Tan C., 148

Huegen, Craig, 285

Hui, Jonathon, 329

Huston, Geoff, 37

IA 450 (International 450

Association), 120

IAB (Internet Advisory Board), 20

- IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority), 21, 210**
- ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), 21, 124**
- ICCB (Internet Control and Configuration Board), 4**
- ICCP (Information, Computer, and Communications Policy), 57**
- Icont for Gate Management System, 132**
- ICT (information and communications technology), 24**
 - adoption strategies
 - government-sponsored, 105–114*
 - mandates, 94–105*
 - national, 90–94*
 - enabling education, 69–71
 - impact on productivity, 58–61
 - Japan, 108
 - local industry development, 68–69
 - stimulating innovation, 66–68
 - WSIS, 62–65
- ICT Framework Program, 115**
- iDEN network, 169**
- IDEs (integrated development environments), 136**
- IEEE Standards Development Organization, 267**
- IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group), 21**
- IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force), 4, 19, 91**
 - IPv6 standards, 119
- IGF (Internet Governance Forum), 64**
- impact of Internet, 5**
- implementation, 151**
 - Bechtel Corporation, 308–317
 - Cisco Systems, 288–289
 - Comcast, 160–164
 - Command Information, 349–353
 - Factice World Bank, 254–255
 - Greek School Network, 239–242
 - Nextel, 179–185
 - SAVVIS, 212–215
 - Tata Communications, 197–202
 - U.S. government, 268–275
- IMS (IP Multimedia Subsystem), 28, 47, 121, 173, 360, 401**
- incremental deployment, 212**
- India, government-sponsored adoption strategies, 113**
- industrial automation, 331**
 - convergence to IP, 302
- industrial networking platforms, 125**
- industrial sensors, 33–34**
- Infonetics Research, 8–10**
- information and communications technology (ICT), 24**
 - enabling education, 69–71
 - impact on productivity, 58–61
 - local industry development, 68–69
 - stimulating innovation, 66–68
 - WSIS, 62–65
- information, demand for, 74–75**
- Information Resources Management (IRM), 271**
- Information Security, 318**
- Information, Computer, and Communications Policy (ICCP), 57**
- information, effect of migration on, 359**
- InfoVista, 222**
- infrastructure**
 - Bechtel Corporation, 294–298
 - Bouygues Telecom, 222–223
 - characteristics of, 151
 - Cisco Systems, 282–284
 - Comcast, 131, 156–157
 - Command Information, 341–342
 - Factice World Bank, 249–251
 - Greek School Network, 236
 - ICT, 91
 - IP, 7–13
 - management, 81
 - migration, planning, 359
 - Nextel, 170–172
 - platforms, creating, 122–127
 - SAVVIS, 209–210
 - Tata Communications, 194–195
 - U.S. government, 263
 - volatile, 363

- in-house developed applications, 137**
- innovation, 177**
 - Bechtel Corporation, 299, 305
 - distributed, 4
 - leadership, establishing through, 132–134
 - standards, 335
 - stimulating, 66–68, 346
- instant messaging services, 239**
- integrated development environments (IDEs), 136**
- Integrated Services (IntServ), 45**
- integration**
 - change management, 322
 - costs, 272
 - devices, 365
 - operating systems, 128
 - operational and governance policies, 375
 - of processes, 360
- Intel, 133**
- intellectual property, 364**
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), 30, 265**
- interactions in IT environments, 359**
- International 450 Association (IA 450), 120**
- international Internet Banking, 254**
- international IPv6 adoption, 196**
- International Mobile Telecommunications IMT-2000 initiative, 120**
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO), 91**
- International Telecommunications Union (ITU), 63, 91**
- Internet**
 - banking, 252
 - cost of downtime, 10
 - growth of, 23–36
 - impact on global economy, 57
 - overview of, 2–7
 - ownership, 64
- Internet Advisory Board (IAB), 20**
- Internet Age educational experience, 69**
- Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), 21, 210**
- Internet Control and Configuration Board (ICCB), 4**
- Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), 21, 124**
- Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), 21**
- Internet Engineering Task Force. *See* IETF**
- Internet Governance Forum (IGF), 64**
- Internet Protocol Next Generation (IPng), 20**
- Internet Protocol. *See* IP**
- Internet Research Steering Group (IRSG), 4**
- Internet Research Task Force (IRTF), 4**
- Internet Society (ISOC), 4**
- Internet2, 70**
- interoperability, 57, 95, 329, 389–390**
 - validation, 127
- intranets, convergence of, 251**
- IntServ (Integrated Services), 45**
- inventory, U.S. government, 273**
- IP (Internet Protocol), 2**
 - addresses, Bechtel Corporation, 295
 - economies of scale, 12–13
 - facilitating and stimulating, 78–80
 - future of, 13–15
 - market transformations, 72–77
 - mobility, 268
 - overview of modern Internet, 2–7
 - sensor networks, 329–331
 - strategic assets, 7–12
 - telephony, 250
- IP Address Encapsulation (IPAE), 21**
- IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), 28, 47, 121, 173, 360, 401**

IP Next Generation Decision Process (ipdecide), 20
IPAE (IP Address Encapsulation), 21
ipdecide (IP Next Generation Decision Process), 20
IPng (Internet Protocol Next Generation), 20
IPv4 (Internet Protocol version 4) address depletion, 400
IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6)
 allocation, 100
 benefits of, 18–36
 constraints and solutions, 36–51
 demand for, 215
 Evaluation Network (AS6175), 180
 Forum, 388
 Forum Task Force, 392
 history of standardization, 19–23
 in other standards, 393–394
 planning, 358–362
 adoption education, 388–394
 assessing IT environments, 371–375
 defining objectives, 362–370
 operational and governance policies, 375–383
 technology education, 383–387
 Promotion Council, 109389
 Ready Logo, 127
 Style, 389
 Task Force, 389
IPv6 over Low power WPANs (6LoWPAN), 34, 126
IPV6STRICT compile-time flag, 136
IRM (Information Resources Management), 271
IRSG (Internet Research Steering Group), 4
IRTF (Internet Research Task Force), 4
ISO (International Organization for Standardization), 91
ISOC (Internet Society), 4

IT (information technology), 101, 151
 assessing, 371–375
 planning, 358–361
 defining objectives, 362–370
 profiles
 Bechtel Corporation, 292–294
 Cisco Systems, 281–282
 Command Information, 340–341
 Factice World Bank, 248–249
 U.S. government, 261–263
IT utility services (SAVVIS)
 case for IPv6, 211–212
 company profile, 205–206
 infrastructure, 209–210
 lessons learned, 215–216
 network profile, 206–207
 perspective on IPv6, 210–211
 planning and implementation, 212–215
ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems), 30, 265
ITU (International Telecommunications Union), 63, 91

J

Japan
 IPv6 Promotion Council Transition Working Group, 393
 research, 115
Japanese Parliament (Diet), 106
Jo, Kwan Bok, 110
Johnson, M. Eric, 9
JV (joint venture) arrangements, 80

K

Kalogeras, Dimitrios, 232
Korean IPv6 Summit (2004), 110
Korean Ministry of Information and Communication (MIC), 109
KOREN, 115

KREONET2, 115

L

labs, phases of, 310
lack of use, 140
large-scale network support, 265
Latin America, 385
launching project goals, 365
leadership, gaining, 81–82
learning, Bechtel Corporation, 323
Legoff, Anne-Marie, 188
lessons learned, 151
 Arch Rock, 334–335
 Bechtel Corporation, 320–324
 Bouygues Telecom, 228–229
 Cisco Systems, 290
 Comcast, 165
 Command Information, 353–354
 Factice World Bank, 255–256
 Greek School Network, 242–244
 Nextel, 185–186
 SAVVIS, 215–216
 Tata Communications, 202–203
 U.S. government, 275–277
Levy-Abegnoli, Eric, 151
Liakopoulos, Athanassios, 232
Licklinder, J. C. R., 56
lifetime, addresses, 222
 Cisco Systems, 283
 Command Information, 341
 U.S. government, 263
Linux, 219
LIR (Local Internet Registry), 239
local economic growth, 11
local industry development, 68–69
Local Internet Registry (LIR), 239
locations, 331
logs, events, 222
low risk IP adoption, 334

M

M&A (mergers and acquisitions), 80

M2M (machine-to-machine), 74
machine-to-machine (M2M), 74
magnet, Internet, 5
maintenance
 IT environments, 80–81
 security, 212
management
 addresses, 157, 250
 Bechtel Corporation, 318–321
 change, 322
 configuration, 135, 360
 costs, 307
 devices, 153
 facilities, 132
 IP addresses, 295
 IT environments, 80–81
 lack of, 226
 operational and governance
 policies, 377–378
 project timelines, 369–370
 refresh cycles, 307
 renumbering networks, 50–51
 security, 48–50, 307
 services, 77, 168
 simplifying, 237
 standardization, 177
 telematics, 30
 tools, 330
mandates
 adoption strategies, 94–105
 government adoption, 93, 210
 requirements driven by, 129
**MANETs (Mobile Ad Hoc Networks),
 196, 76**
Market Connections, Inc., 102
markets
 mobile phone, 27–28
 transformations, 72–77
 transportation, 30
Marsan, Carolyn Duffy, 273
MasterCard Worldwide, 245
Matsushita, 132
maturity of technology, 243
**measurements, project timelines,
 369–370**

Memorandum for the Chief

Information Officers, 101
mergers and acquisitions (M&A), 80
messages, SMS, 220
methodologies, 360
metrics, 315, 369–370
MIC (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications), 107
Microsoft, 133
 conformance tests, 128
 Windows Peer-to-Peer
 Networking, 365, 392
Microsoft Office SharePoint Server (MOSS), 319
middleware, RUNES, 126
migration, planning, 358–361
 adoption education, 388–394
 assessing IT environments, 371–375
 defining objectives, 362–370
 operational and governance policies, 375–383
 technology education, 383–387
milestones, 369–370
mindshare, capturing early, 346
minimal disruptions, 212
Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC), 107
MIP (Mobile IP), 47
MIPv6 (Mobile IPv6), 48, 126, 173
MLD (Multicast Listener Discovery), 131
Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (MANETs), 76, 196
mobile communications, fixed-mobile convergence, 76
mobile GSM technologies, EU adoption strategies, 111
Mobile IP (MIP), 47
Mobile IPv6 (MIPv6), 48, 126, 173
mobile phone market segment, 27–28
mobile services, 168
 Bouygues Telecom
 case for IPv6, 224
 company profile, 220–221

infrastructure, 222–223
 lessons learned, 228–229
 network profile, 221–222
 perspective on IPv6, 223–224
 planning, 225–227
 Tata Communications, 191
mobility, 122
 IP, 268
 overview of, 46–48
monitoring
 cargo, 31
 feature, 226
Moonv6 project, 105, 392
Mori, Yoshiro, 106
MOSS (Microsoft Office SharePoint Server), 319
MSOs (multiple system operators), 84, 155
Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD), 131
multicasting
 applications, 225
 NYU, 130
multihoming, 99, 122
 Nextel, 176
 support, 40–43
multiple access hand-offs, 122
multiple system operators (MSOs), 84, 155
MySpace, 76, 187

N

Naked Sun, The, 402
NANOG conference (2006), 131
nano-machines, 75
Napolitan, Rick, 8
NAT (Network Address Translation), 13, 85, 399
 benefits of, 39
national adoption strategies, 90–94
National Higher Education ICT Initiative, 69

- National ICT Industry Alliance (NICTIA), 117**
- National Information Infrastructure (NII), 95**
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 86**
- national IT strategies, 401**
- National LambdaRail, Inc. (NLR), 115**
- National Research and Education Networks (NREN), 232**
- national research environments, 114–117**
- natural technology evolution, 301**
- naysayers, 322**
- NDP (Neighbor Discovery protocol), 44**
- needs, market transformations, 72–77**
- needs-based technology evolution, 4**
- Neighbor Discovery protocol (NDP), 44**
- NEMO (Network Mobility), 48, 77, 126, 196**
- Neotel, 188, 191**
- Net-Centric Operations and Warfare Reference Model (NCOW RM), 95**
- Network Address Translation. *See* NAT**
- Network Mobility (NEMO), 48, 77, 126, 196**
- Network Operations Centers (NOCs), 194**
- Network Time Protocol (NTP), 44**
- Network-Centric Checklist, 95**
- networks, 162**
- ad hoc, 47
 - enterprise, 79
 - industrial, evolution of, 33–34
 - outages, 8
 - platforms, 124
 - profiles, 151
 - Arch Rock, 329–331*
 - Bechtel Corporation, 292–294*
 - Bouygues Telecom, 221–222*
 - Comcast, 155–156*
 - Greek School Network, 233–235*
 - Nextel, 169–171*
 - SAVVIS, 206–207*
 - Tata Communications, 191–194*
 - renumbering, 50–51
 - sensors, 133
 - social, 76
 - upgrading, 239
- new services, 153**
- New York University. *See* NYU**
- News Corp., 76**
- Newstrom, George, 59**
- Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen), 265**
- Next Generation Network Global Standards Initiative (NGN-GSI), 120**
- Next Generation Networks. *See* NGNs**
- Nextel**
- case for IPv6, 174–179
 - case study, 166–186
 - company profile, 167–169
 - infrastructure, 171–172
 - lessons learned, 185–186
 - network profile, 169–171
 - perspective on IPv6, 172–174
 - planning and implementation, 179–185
- NextGen (Next Generation Air Transportation System), 265**
- Nextworx program, 129**
- NGN-GSI (Next Generation Network Global Standards Initiative), 120**
- NGNs (Next Generation Networks), 12, 72**
- NICTIA (National ICT Industry Alliance), 117**
- Nightingale, Steven, 275**
- NII (National Information Infrastructure), 95**
- Nimrod, 21**

NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), 86
 guidelines, 272

NLR (National LambdaRail, Inc.), 115

NNCOW RM (Net-Centric Operations and Warfare Reference Model), 95

NOCs (Network Operations Centers), 194

Nodes, number of deployed, 34

North American IPv6 Task Force, 94, 389

North Asian Triangle, 116

NREN (National Research and Education Networks), 232

NRO (Number Resource Organization), 97

NTP (Network Time Protocol), 44

NTT, 99, 132

NTT DoCoMo, 220

Number Resource Organization (NRO), 97

numbers
 ARIN, 92
 depletion of, 35
 growth of Internet, 23–36

NYU (New York University), multicasting, 130

O

objective perspectives, presenting, 149

observability, 142

OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), 57, 78, 93

office automation (OA) applications, 359

OMB (Office of Management and Budget), 101

on-demand collaboration, 364

online shopping, 3

open IP model adoption, 334

Open Systems Interconnection. *See* OSI

operating systems, 123
 adoption perspective, 400–401
 Bechtel Corporation, 294
 Bouygues Telecom, 221
 Cisco Systems, 282
 Command Information, 340
 Factice World Bank, 248, 254
 integration, 128
 mobile services, 219
 SAVVIS, 207

operational expenditure (OPEX), 24, 71

operational policies, 375–383

operations simplifications, 80–81

OPEX (operational expenditure), 24, 71

optimization
 packet processing, 173
 routing, 40

optimizing entrance and acceptance policies, 380

Orange France, 221

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 78, 93

organization profile, Greek School Network, 232–233

OSI (Open Systems Interconnection), 20

outages, network, 8

over-the-top service providers, 79

ownership, Internet, 64

P

P Internet Protocol (PIP), 21

packets, processing, 173

PANs (personal-area networks), 76

paradigm shifts, 322

partner adoption of IPv6, 301

- PBN (Performance-Based Navigation), 265**
- Peer Naming Resolution Protocol (PNRP), 400**
- peer to peer applications, enabling, 237**
- Peer-to-Peer Name Resolution Protocol (PNRP), 44**
- penetration of the modern Internet, 3**
- performance, Cisco Systems, 288**
- Performance-Based Navigation (PBN), 265**
- persistence, 321**
- personal-area networks (PANs), 76**
- perspective on IPv6**
 - Bechtel Corporation, 298–300
 - Bouygues Telecom, 223–224
 - Cisco Systems, 285–287
 - Command Information, 342–345
 - Factice World Bank, 251–253
 - Greek School Network, 236–237
 - Nextel, 172–174
 - SAVVIS, 210–211
 - Tata Communications, 195–196
 - U.S. government, 264–266
- petabits, 191**
- Pew Internet & American Life Project report (2004), 75**
- PEW Internet Report (2006), 3**
- phases, labs, 310**
- physical access, ICT spending and, 61**
- pilot projects, value of, 243**
- PIP (P Internet Protocol), 21, 169**
- planning, 151**
 - addresses, 387
 - Bechtel Corporation, 308–317
 - Bouygues Telecom, 225–227
 - Cisco Systems, 288–289
 - Comcast, 160–164
 - Command Information, 349–353
 - early, 215
 - Factice World Bank, 254–255
 - Greek School Network, 239–242
 - migration, 358–362
 - adoption education, 388–394*
 - assessing IT environments, 371–375*
 - defining objectives, 362–370*
 - operational and governance policies, 375–383*
 - technology education, 383–387*
 - Nextel, 179–185
 - Project development, 370
 - SAVVIS, 212–215
 - Tata Communications, 197–202
 - transitions, 303
 - U.S. government, 268–275
- platforms, creating infrastructure, 122–127**
- plug and play autoconfiguration, 43–45**
- PNRP (Peer-to-Peer Name Resolution Protocol), 44, 400**
- points of presence (PoP), 175**
- policies, 271**
 - content availability, defining, 381
 - development, updating, 380
 - entrance and acceptance, 380
 - operational and governance, 375–383
 - prefix allocation, 40–43
 - project execution, 381–383
 - purchasing, 226, 379
 - updating, 380
- pool resizing, 172**
- POP (points of presence), 175**
- Popoviciu, Ciprian, 151**
- Poppe, Yves, 188**
- population, earth versus Internet users, 24–27**
- portable address blocks, 99**
- portals (web), Greek School Network, 239**
- prefixes, allocation, 40–43, 97, 100**
- priority of markets, raising, 104**

private address space, 250
private banking sectors, 246
processes, migration, 360
processing packets, 173
product maturity of IPv6, 401
Product Security Incident Response Team (PSIRT), 250
production environments, risk in, 306
productivity, 11
 ICT impact on, 58–61
products
 assessing, 373–374
 availability, 140, 203
profiles, 151
 company, 151
 Arch Rock, 328–329
 Bechtel Corporation, 291–292
 Bouygues Telecom, 220–221
 Cisco Systems, 279–281
 Comcast, 154–155
 Command Information, 338–340
 Factice World Bank, 247
 Nextel, 167–169
 SAVVIS, 205–206
 Tata Communications, 189–191
 U.S. government, 260–261
IT
 Cisco Systems, 281–282
 Command Information, 340–341
 Factice World Bank, 248–249
 U.S. government, 261–263
networks
 Arch Rock, 329–331
 Bechtel Corporation, 292–294
 Bouygues Telecom, 221–222
 Comcast, 155–156
 Greek School Network, 233–235
 Nextel, 169–171

SAVVIS, 206–207
Tata Communications, 191–194
 organization, Greek School Network, 232–233

projects
 development, 370
 execution policies, 381–383
 goals, 365–366, 376
 national research environments and, 114–117
 scope, 309, 366–368
 sponsors, 318
 timelines, 368–370

protocols
 applications, 137
 CLNP, 20
 consistency of, 105
 extensibility, 67
 IP, 2. *See also* IP
 NDP, 44
 PIP, 21
 PNRP, 44, 400
 SCTP, 400
 transport, 330

provides, 142
provisioning, 67, 224
proximity, 331
PSIRT (Product Security Incident Response Team), 250
PSTN (public switched telephone network), 105
Pudar, Nenad, 188
purchasing policies, 226, 379
push technologies, 225

Q

QA (quality assurance), 135, 360
QoS (quality of service), 45–46
 Nextel, 173
quality assurance (QA), 135, 360
quality of service. *See* QoS
Qwest Government Services, 129

R

radio access network (RAN), 170
radio-frequency identification (RFID), 34
Raghavan, Raju, 188
RAN (radio access network), 170
reachability, 29, 180
reactive transition, 303
readers, 34
Real-Time Operations solution, 222
Reconfigurable Ubiquitous Networked Embedded Systems (RUNES), 125
recycle issues, 92
redundant parallel network infrastructures, 24
references, 390
refresh cycles, 307
Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), 37, 92
relative technological advantage, 142
remote access, Cisco Systems, 284
RENATER, 70
renumbering networks, 50–51
requests for proposals (RFPs), 298
requirements
 connections, 210
 customers, 301
 mandates, requirements driven by, 129
 operating system integration of applications, 128
 zero impact of IPv6, 129
research, 391–392
 Command Information, 349
 Japan, annual investment of, 108
 national environments, 114–117
 RUNES, 126
 support for national, 93

resizing, pool, 172
resources, education, 385–386
return on investment (ROI), 257
reuse, equipment, 181
RFC 3633 (DHCPv6 prefix delegation), 45
RFID (radio-frequency identification), 34
RFPs (requests for proposals), 298
Rich, Yurie, 336
RIPE, 92
RIPE NCC (RIR for Europe), 99
RIR (Regional Internet Registries), 37
RIR for Asia Pacific (APNIC), 99
RIR for Europe (RIPE NCC), 99
RIRs (Regional Internet Registries), 92
ROAD (Routing and Addressing) working group, 20
ROI (return on investment), 82, 257.
 See also costs
routers, dedicated, 181
routing
 optimizing, 40
 tables, expanding, 19
Routing and Addressing (ROAD) working group, 20
RUNES (European Reconfigurable Ubiquitous Networked Embedded Systems) project, 33, 125

S

SaaS (software as a service) applications, 209
Saitama Building, 132
Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), 271
satellites, geostationary, 191

SAVVIS

- case for IPv6, 211–212
- case study, 204–216
- company profile, 205–206
- infrastructure, 209–210
- lessons learned, 215–216
- network profile, 206–207
- perspective on IPv6, 210–211
- planning and implementation, 212–215

SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition), 9**scalability, 57**

- address space, 172
- infrastructure at Comcast, 131

schedules

- deployment, 272
- product and feature delivery, 369

schemes

- addresses, 283
- addressing, 272
- renumbering, 50–51

Schreyer, Paul, 58**scope, project, 309, 366–368****SCTE (Society of Cable Telecommunications Engineers), 164****SCTP (Stream Control Transmission Protocol), 400****SDKs (software development kits), 123****SEA-ME-WE-4 (South East Asia-Middle East-West Europe 4) project, 194****seamless handover, 219****SEC (Software Engineering and Construction), 319****Second Life, 76****security, 48-50**

- end-to-end, 223
- Factice World Bank, 253
- Information Security, 318
- maintenance, 212
- management, 307
- Nextel, 172
- policies, updating, 380
- project scope, 367
- sensors, 330
- simplifying, 237
- threats, 10
- U.S. government, 274

Security-Town, 107**segmentation, 172****selection of broad spectrums, 149****senior IS&T management, 318****senior management visibility, 376****Sensinode, 133****sensors, 75, 284**

- Arch Rock, 329–330
 - case for IPv6, 331–333*
 - lessons learned, 334–335*
- Arch Rock case study, 324–335
- industrial, 33–34
- networks, 133
- standards, 121

September 11, 2001, 6**service providers (SPs), 96**

- case studies, 152
 - Bouygues Telecom, 216–229*
 - Comcast, 153–165*
 - Nextel, 166–186*
 - SAVVIS, 204–216*
 - Tata Communications, 187–203*

- growth of, 78–79

service-oriented architecture (SOA), 360

services, 191

- AAA, 239
- business-critical, 71–82
- customer, 127–130
- deployment, 365
- directory, 239
- DNS, 124
- dual-stack, 273
- enabling, 241
- existing, enabling, 179
- ICT software, 59
- ICT spending and, 61
- interruptions, 10
- Japan, 109
- leadership, establishing through, 130–131
- managed, 77
- new, 153
- Nextel, 168
- ROI for, 84
- SMS, 220
- value-added, 179
- virtualizing, 12
- VPNv6, 183

sessions, BoF, 20**Shiodome Building, 132****shopping online, 3****Short Message Service (SMS), 220****Simple Internet Protocol (SIP), 21****Simple Internet Protocol Plus (SIPP), 21****simplicity, 95****SIP (Simple Internet Protocol), 21****SIPP (Simple Internet Protocol Plus), 21****sizing address spaces, 354****skill sets, 354****smartphones, 250****SMEs (subject matter experts), 141, 347****SMS (Short Message Service), 220****SNL (Sandia National Laboratories), 271****SOA (service-oriented architecture), 360****social networks, 76****Society of Cable Telecommunications Engineers (SCTE), 164****software**

- certification cycles, 368
- computing platforms, 123
- ICT software, 59
- U.S. government, 273

software as a service (SaaS)**applications, 209****software development kits (SDKs), 123****Software Engineering and Construction (SEC), 319****Software Quality Assurance (SQA), 319****solutions, 36–51****source software, 243****SourceForge.net, 136****Source-Specific Multicast (SSM), 131****South Korea**

- government-sponsored adoption strategies, 106, 111
- research, 115

SPs. *See* service providers (SPs), 96**space****addresses**

- Bouygues Telecom*, 223
- private*, 250
- scalability*, 172
- sizing*, 354
- Tata Communications*, 195
- private*, 250

Specific Support Action, 385**spending, ICT, 59****sponsors**

- adoption, 93
- projects, 318

Sprint Nextel. *See* Nextel**Sprint PCS, 169****SprintLink, 169****SQA (Software Quality Assurance), 319****Srivastava, Mani, 326****SSM (Source-Specific Multicast), 131**

SSP (Stockpile Stewardship Program), 271

standardization, 57

history of IPv6, 19–23
management, 177

standards, 360

compliance, 389–390
defining, 119–122
equipment, 274
innovation, 335
IPv6 in other, 393–394

starting points, 137

stateless address autoconfiguration, 367

stateless autoconfiguration, 29

Stenbit, John, 94

stimulating innovation, 66–68

stimulating IP environments, 78–80

Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP), 271

Stokab, The, 181

strategic assets, IP, 7–12

strategic change, Bechtel

Corporation projects, 320

strategic objectives, alignment with, 363–364

strategies

adoption

challenges, 138–142
government-sponsored, 105–114
mandates, 94–105
national, 90–94
national research environments and projects, 114–117

business, 117–118

creating infrastructure platforms, 122–127
customer service, 127–130
defining standards, 119–122
establishing leadership through innovation, 132–134

establishing leadership through services, 130–131
following other companies, 134–138

Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP), 400

STUN/TURN, 173

subject matter experts (SMEs), 141, 347

subscribers, high densities of, 218

subsea cables, 193

Supervisory Control and Data

Acquisition (SCADA), 9

supplier-induced IPv6 insertion, 301 support

adoption education, 388–394
equipment, 268, 274
for national research, 93
large-scale networks, 265
of multihomed sites, 40–43
technology education, 383–387

Symbian, 219

T

tables, routing, 19

TAHI suites, 109

Taito, Japan, 107

Tata Communications

case for IPv6, 196–197
case study, 187–203
company profile, 189–191
infrastructure, 194–195
lessons learned, 202–203
networks profile, 191–194
perspective on IPv6, 195–196
planning and implementation, 197–202

Tata Indicom Cable, 191

TCP and UDP with Bigger Addresses (TUBA), 21

TCP/IP Internet specifications, 4

teams

Bechtel Corporation, 318–320
core, 318

TEC (Telecommunication Engineering Center), 113
technology education, 104, 383–387
technology shifts, 322
TEIN (Trans Eurasia Information Network), 115
Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), 113
Telecommunication Engineering Center (TEC), 113
Telecoms & Internet converged Services & Protocols for Advanced Network (TISPAN), 121
Teleglobe, 191, 197
telematics, 30
telepresence, 402
terrorism, 6
testbed network (Sprint), 175
testing
 conformance, 128
 environments, 272–273, 365
 standard compliancy, 390
threats, security, 10
timelines
 Bechtel deployments, 316
 projects, 368–370
TISPAN (Telecoms & Internet converged Services & Protocols for Advanced Network), 121
Tokyo, Japan, 107
Tolentino, Lawrence F., 148
tools, management, 330
ToS (Type of Service), 45
tracking cargo, 31
traffic management, Nextel, 181
TRAI (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India), 113
training, 162, 268
 assessment, 386
 Bechtel Corporation, 323
 Cisco Systems, 288
 Command Information, 349
 domains, 384
 U.S. government, 273

Trans Eurasia Information Network (TEIN), 115
transformations, markets, 72–77
transitions, 303
 existing applications, 268
 technologies, minimizing, 322
transport protocols, 330
transportation, 30–32
triability, 142
Tribe.net, 76
troubleshooting
 academic perspective of IPv6, 142
 industry perspective of IPv6, 138–141
TUBA (TCP and UDP with Bigger Addresses), 21
Tunis 2005, 63
tunnels, GRE, 175
Tyco Global Network, 191
types of addresses, 209, 222, 263, 283, 341
Type of Service (ToS), 45

U

U-2010 project, 111
u-Japan Policy, 108
U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), 102
U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), 101
U.S. government
 case for IPv6, 266–267
 company profile, 260–261
 infrastructure, 263
 IT profile, 261–263
 lessons learned, 275–277
 perspective on IPv6, 264–266
 planning and implementation, 268–275
U.S. Postal Service, 362
UMTS Terrestrial Remote Access Network (UTRAN), 218
UN (United Nations), 63

UNH-IOL (University of New Hampshire InterOperability Laboratory), 392
United Kingdom, ICT spending in, 60
United Nations (UN), 63
United States, research, 114
University of Pennsylvania, 84
updating
 development policies, 380
 policies, 271
 purchasing policies, 226, 379
 security policies, 380
upgrading
 networks, 239
 U.S. government, 273
use, lack of, 140
Utah Street Networks, 76
UTRAN (UMTS Terrestrial Remote Access Network), 218

V

validation, interoperability, 127
value-added services, 179
values
 of IP, 2
 of modern Internet, 4
Varvarigos, Manos, 240
Vehicle Infrastructure Integration (VII), 265
vehicle to vehicle communication, 30
vendors
 applications, 269
 readiness, ensuring for IPv6, 177
 references, 390
Verizon, 79
Verizon Business Services, 129
VII (Vehicle Infrastructure Integration), 265
Virtual Private Networks. *See* VPNs
virtualizing services, 12
Visa Inc., 245
Voice over IP (VoIP) telephony, 70

voice services, 168
 devices, 284
 Tata Communications, 190
VoIP (Voice over IP) telephony, 70, 79, 218, 225
volatile infrastructure, 363
Vonage, 79
VPNs (Virtual Private Networks), 9
VPNv6 services, Nextel, 183
VSNL (Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited) International. *See* Tata Communications

W

walled-in garden environments, 148
WANs (wide-area networks), 9
web filtering services, 239
web hosting, Greek School Network, 239
web proxy services, 239
Wettling, Fred, 318
WG (working group), 20
Whitcomb, Laura, 8
WIDE project, 115
wide-area networks. *See* WANs
Wi-Fi (wireless fidelity), 13
Wilson, Jeff, 8
WiMAX (Worldwide Interoperability for Microwave Access), 13
Windows Mobile, 219
wireless access, 250
 Cisco Systems, 284
wireless fidelity. *See* Wi-Fi
wireless personal-area network (WPAN), 121
WITSA (World Information Technology and Services Alliance), 58
workforce, mobile, 363
working group (WG), 20
World Summit on Information Society. *See* WSIS

**Worldwide Interoperability for
Microwave Access. *See* WiMAX**
**WPAN (wireless personal-area
network), 121**
**WSIS (World Summit on
Information Society), 63–65**

Y

YouTube, 74, 187

Z

zero impact of IPv6, requiring, 129
ZigBee Alliance, 121, 133