

# Early Review Status Update

draft-ietf-dmm-ondemand-mobility-14

Danny Moses

# Update Since WGLC

- The draft was reviewed by Brian Huberman and his review status was: Not Ready
- Several issues were raised and I have presented responses on the list on June 10<sup>th</sup>.
- Since then, several emails were exchanges between Brian, Sri and myself with the goal to resolve these issues.
- The current status is:
  - The first issue is most-likely resolved assuming acceptance by the WG
  - The other issues are still pending Brian's responses

# Issue #1: IP Session Concept

## Initial comment:

Where is the concept of an IP session defined? Given that IP is connectionless, this term is really about IP address stability and its lifetime. A new term could/should be coined to reflect what is really needed.

## Response:

We have currently agreed to replace “IP Session Continuity” with “Session Continuity”.

We are also replacing the original text: “The ability to maintain an ongoing IP session...” by –

“The ability to maintain an ongoing transport interaction...”

## Next step:

Receive approval from the WG

# Issue #2: Clarify difference from other ID/Location split issues

## Initial comment:

The needs described in this document have a mix of the ID/Location split issues raised in a variety of other specifications. It would be good to clarify what is different here.

## Response:

I clarified that this document is not introducing yet another solution for maintaining an IP address after a mobility event, but rather, enabling application running on the mobile host to indicate to the network whether or not they desire this service.

## Next step:

Waiting for a response as to whether or not this clarifies the concern. No requirement for text change has been identify so far.

# Issue #3: Implications on PMIP

## Initial comment:

The draft only references host-based Mobile IP specifications. What are the implications when other solutions (e.g., PMIP) are employed?

## Response:

I clarified that the document is actually relevant to any solution in which the network performs some operation to maintain the host's IP prefix by proxy. So PMIP is relevant and is referenced by the document.

## Next step:

Waiting for a response as to whether or not this clarifies the concern.

No requirement for text change has been identify so far.

# Issue #4: Missing definition of interaction between the host and the network

## Initial comment:

It is problematic that this document explicitly rules out of scope any discussion of how this API interacts with address assignment methods (e.g., DHCP). Clearly, there will need to be a way for this API to influence each of the address assignment methods available. Some of the classes of IP addresses described in this document require certain lifetime guarantees from the address assignment method. That needs to be addressed since it will require changes to every assignment method.

## Response:

- I clarified that there are other drafts that extend DHCPv6 and RA.
- The response was that a architecture/framework description is missing.
- I referred to sections 3.3 and 3.4 which contains that description.

## Next step:

Waiting for a response as to whether or not this clarifies the concern.

No requirement for text change has been identified so far.

## Issue #5: This work should be done in other SDOs

Initial comment:

The IETF has a very checkered history of success in getting APIs standardized within the appropriate group (POSIX/Austin/Open). Has this proposed API been discussed within that community?

Response:

- I indicated that it was not discussed in the SDOs that were listed but is required by 3GPP for release 15.
- The response triggered another question about the behavior in WiFi connections in LTE networks.
- My reply indicated that this specific document refers to the interface between applications and the mobile host's IP stack. The other work (DHCPv6 and RA) refer to the interaction with the network. This other work is not specific to cellular only infrastructure.

Waiting for a response as to whether or not this clarifies the concern.

No requirement for text change has been identified so far.