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## Background

- Current IPv6 Address Allocation policies refer to the use of the Host Density Ratio as a metric for 'acceptable' utilization of address space
- Original Def'n: RFC 1715
- Re-stated Def'n: RFC 3194
- Current IPv6 Address Allocation policies use an HDRatio value of 0.8 as an allocation threshold value
-Why 0.8?
- This value is based on a small number of case studies described in RFC 1715 - no further analysis of the underlying model or the selection of an appropriate threshold value as an IP network efficiency metric has been published
- Does this HD-Ratio value provide "reasonable" outcomes in terms of address utilization?


## The HD Ratio Metric

- IPv4 fixed 80\% Density

Host-Count / Address-Count = 0.8

- IPv6 0.8 HD Ratio
$\log ($ Host - Count $) / \log ($ Address - Count $)=0.8$

Under the HD-Ratio, the overall address utilization efficiency level falls exponentially in line with the size of the address block. Large allocations have a very small density threshold, while smaller allocations have a much higher threshold.

## IPv4 / IPv6 Allocation equivalence table

| Host Count | $80 \%$ | $H D=0.8$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| End Customer Size | IPv4 Allocation | IPv6 Allocation |
| 205 | 124 | 132 |
| 410 | 123 | 132 |
| 819 | 122 | 132 |
| 1638 | 121 | 132 |
| 3277 | 120 | 132 |
| 7131 | 118 | 132 |
| 12416 | 118 | 131 |
| 21618 | 117 | 130 |
| 37640 | 116 | 129 |
| 65536 | 115 | 128 |
| 114104 | 114 | 127 |
| 198668 | 114 | 126 |
| 345901 | 113 | 125 |
| 602248 | 112 | 124 |
| 1048576 | 111 | 123 |
| 1825676 | 110 | 122 |
| 3178688 | 110 | 121 |
| 5534417 | 19 | 120 |
| 9635980 | 18 | 119 |
| 16777216 | 17 | 118 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## IPv6 Address Efficiency Table

| IPv6 | Block Size | $\mathrm{HD}=0.8$ | Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prefix | (148s) | Host Count | Efficiency |
| 132 | 65,536 | 7,132 | 11\% |
| 131 | 131,072 | 12,417 | 9\% |
| 130 | 262,144 | 21,619 | 8\% |
| 129 | 524,288 | 37,641 | 7\% |
| 128 | 1,048,576 | 65,536 | 6\% |
| 127 | 2,097,152 | 114,015 | 5\% |
| 126 | 4,194,304 | 198,668 | 5\% |
| 125 | 8,388,608 | 345,901 | 4\% |
| 124 | 16,777,216 | 602,249 | 4\% |
| 123 | 33,554,432 | 1,048,576 | 3\% |
| 122 | 67,108,864 | 1,825,677 | 3\% |
| 121 | 134,217,728 | 3,178,688 | 2\% |
| 120 | 268,435,456 | 5,534,417 | 2\% |
| 119 | 536,870,912 | 9,635,980 | 2\% |
| 118 | 1,073,741,824 | 16,777,216 | 2\% |

Using a fixed 16 bit subnet length

## Modelling the HD Ratio

- Does this HD Ratio value produce reasonable outcomes?
-The approach reported here is to look at recent IPv4 allocation data, and simulate an equivalent IPv6 registry operating user a similar address demand profile


## IPv6 Registry simulation exercise

- Use recent RIR IPv4 allocation data to create a demand model of an IPv6 address registry
- Assume a sequence of IPv6 transactions based on a demand model derived from the sequence of recorded IPv4 allocations
- Convert IPv4 to IPv6 allocations by assuming an equivalence of an IPv4 end-user-assignment of a /32 with an IPv6 end-user-assignment of a /48
- IPv4 uses a constant host density of $80 \%$ while IPv6 uses a HD-Ratio of 0.8
- Use a minimum IPv6 allocation unit of a /32
- Assume IPv4 allocation timeframe mean of 12 months


## Allocation Simulation results

Registry Allocations


## Prefix Distribution

Prefix Length Distribution HD $=0.8$


## HD Ratio Observations

- One interpretation of the HD Ratio is that it corresponds to a network model where an additional component of internal network hierarchy is introduced for each doubling of the address block size
- A HD Ratio of 0.8 corresponds to a network with a per-level efficiency of $70 \%$, and adding an additional level of hierarchy as the network increases in size by a factor of 8


## Hierarchical Network Model

Network

Region Region Region Product Product Product POP POP POP


## Customer Customer Customer

## Comparison of HD Ratio and Compound Hierarchy

HD vs Stepped


## Interpreting the HD Ratio

- For a /32 allocation the 0.8 HD ratio is comparable to 6 levels of internal hierarchy with 70\% efficiency at each level
- For a /24 this corresponds to an internal network hierarchy of 9 levels, each at 70\% efficiency
- Altering the HD Ratio effectively alters comparable model rate of growth in internal levels of network hierarchy


## $H D=0.94$

- This corresponds to a network model that uses base efficiency of 0.75 at each level of internal network structure, with a new level of hierarchy added for each additional 5 bits of address prefix length (x 32)


## Varying the HD Ratio



## Varying the HD Ratio - Detail

Address Efficiency - I32 through to /18


## Allocation Simulation $-\mathrm{HD}=0.94$

Registry Allocations (HD = 0.94)


## Prefix Distribution - HD = 0.94

Prefix Length Distribution HD $=0.94$


## Comparison of prefix size distributions

Comparison of Prefix Distributions


## Observations

- $80 \%$ of all allocations are /31 and /32 for HD ratio of 0.8 or higher
- Changing the HD ratio will not impact most allocations in a steady state registry function
- Only $2 \%$ of all allocations are larger than a /27
- For these larger allocations the target efficiency is lifted from $4 \%$ to $25 \%$ by changing the HD Ratio from 0.8 to 0.94 ( $25 \%$ is equivalent to 5 levels of internal hierarchy each with $75 \%$ efficiency)
- Total 3 year address consumption is reduced by a factor of 10 in changing the HD ratio from 0.8 to 0.94


## What is a "good" HD Ratio to use?

- Need to consider what is common practice in today's network in terms of internal architecture
- APNIC is conducting a survey of ISPs in the region on network structure and internal levels of address hierarchy and will present the findings at APNIC 20
- Need to define a common 'baseline' efficiency level rather than an average attainable level
- What value would be readily achievable by large and small networks without resorting to renumbering or internal route fragmentation?
- Need to consider overall longer term objectives
- Anticipated address pool lifetime
- Anticipated size of the routing space


## Thank you

## Questions?

