

Study Group on Internet's Smooth Transition to IPv6—1st Meeting
Summary of Minutes (Draft)

1. Date and Time

Wednesday, August 8, 2007; 13:30–15:30

2. Location

Main Conference Rooms B to E, Mita Kyoyo Kaigijo, 3rd floor,

3. Attendees (honorifics omitted)

(1) Study group members (In order of Japanese syllabary)

Takashi Arano, Hiroshi Esaki, Yoshihiro Obata, Hiroshi Sumimura, Jiro Kokuryo, Tadao Saito, Tetsuo Takemura, Noriyuki Tsuchimori, Yoshimasa Tokui, Toshihiro Naito, Masataka Nakamura, Hitoshi Niki, Takashi Hanazawa, Keiichi Makizono, Mikio Mizutani, Takamichi Miyoshi, Yutaka Yasuda, Taketsune Watanabe

(2) MIC Representatives

Suzuki (Vice Minister for Policy Coordination), Terasaki (Director-General, Telecommunications Bureau), Takeuchi (Director-General, Telecommunications Business Department), Ando (Director, General Affairs Division), Taniwaki (Director, Telecommunications Policy Division), Kurose (Director, Computer Communications Division), Honma (Senior Advisor, Telecommunications Policy Division), Yagishima (Senior Planning Officer, Computer Communications Division), Nakamura (Deputy-Director, Telecommunications Policy Division), Takamura (Deputy-Director, Computer Communications Division)

4. Agenda

- (1) Operation policy of study group
- (2) Method of conducting study group
- (3) Current situation of IPv4 and IPv6
- (4) Others

5. Meeting Summary

[Outline of the study group]

- “Outline of the Study Group (Draft)” (Attachment 1-1) was approved as proposed by the secretariat.

[Study group public disclosure]

- “Study Group Public Disclosure” (Attachment 1-2) was approved as proposed by the secretariat.

[Selection of chairperson and appointment of deputy chair]

- Mr. Saito was selected as the chair, after which Mr. Saito then appointed Mr. Kokuryo as deputy chair.

[Operating policies of the study group]

- “Operating Policies (Draft)” (Attachment 1-3) was approved as proposed by the secretariat.

[Method of conducting the study group]

- “Method of Conducting the Study Group (Draft)” (Attachment 1-4) was explained by the secretariat.

- Main Comments

(Member)

In “Outline of the Study Group (Draft)”, IPv6 is shown as the only solution, but in the description of the actual process, it feels as though you are trying to support the logic for going to IPv6. Please explain this gap.

(Secretariat)

As we want you to verify that IPv6 is truly the only method we have, we described the actual process in a neutral way. If IPv4 is going to be discontinued, we will transition to IPv6. The bottom line is that we think we might eventually conclude that IPv6 is not the solution.

(Member)

In terms of international trends, etc., we should review this carefully, even if it means getting a budget for it.

(Secretariat)

We have asked Mitsubishi Research Institute to support the secretariat so that they can help us as much as possible when we need information.

(Member)

With IANA’s address pool rumored to become depleted by around 2010, are we really going to be in time with the final report in March 2008? Shouldn’t we submit an interim report as early as possible?

(Secretariat)

Regarding the schedule, we have been asked to reply by March of next year, so it would be helpful if the conclusion of discussions comes out earlier.

(Member)

How are we going to explain the discussions of this study group to the world?

(Chair)

As the Japanese government and study group members have various channels for globalization, we ask that you use them well to handle this issue.

- Chair Saito appointed the members of “Working Group Members (Tentative)” (Attachment 1-5) as WG members.

- Chair Saito appointed Mr. Esaki as the WG leader.

[Current situation of IPv4 and IPv6]

- Mr. Arano explained “Depletion of IPv4 Address Pool and Efforts of JPNIC” (Attachment 1-6).
- WG leader Esaki explained “Towards the Transition to IPv6” (Attachment 1-7).

- Main Comments from Members

- Earlier, a case using a very expensive device for PPPoE was presented. At our company, we are able to procure the device cheaper than a router.

- This means that technology and costs do not always match, and we should discuss this carefully.

- Even in the routing of IPv4, as addresses aggregate at a certain unit in operations, IPv6 may not necessarily be a solution for the explosion of routing cables. We need to discuss the trends in operations as well.

- IPv6 employs a very different routing method from IPv4 at the base, so I have strong doubts about whether the business structure of having the ISP at the access providers as done now will actually work. I am not sure of the future direction—whether IPv6 will serve to resolve this problem, or if we will need to change the business structure to resolve it—but we need to consider technological trends while watching overseas trends carefully.

- I don't think it is easy to reach an agreement for topics related to business and business structure, because there are so many different opinions, so we first need to focus on how we are going to provide the technology. After that, we can create the opportunity for business adjustments.

- The fact that we need to take concerted actions clearly indicates the reality of not being able to cling to IPv4 any longer. In respect to this, as long as we all clearly understand that we are in an environment which allows IPv6 to be developed in an ideal way, even on a global basis, we can think of projects, business, and so on separately.

- As we will not be able to win internationally if we use technology in a negative way, we should find approaches that would prevent any constraints in later operations by providing technical grounds honestly. As failure will occur at some point if we push it, I hope this study group will serve as the venue for determining the future course for this technically.

- Establishing a structure that can also be expanded to other countries by reviewing architecture technology in ways that are not bound by the current situation will become indispensable for vendors,

ISPs, and ISPs expanded to overseas.

- Rather than being mired in the past, it is important to think of new foundations for this country from zero. We need to construct business models that will work properly in this industry in the future, so first we need the industry to solve that. I hope that this can be realized through competition. It should be something in which various players can participate. Then we can think of ways for each of these players to participate, and then think of whether it is possible to establish incentives for a smooth transition.
- Japan is said to be special in the world in the area of IPv4 networks. We should first focus on the technology, and, once we have reached a conclusion and discovered that there are other requirements, we should discuss these issues in meetings, etc.