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Technology co-ordinators:
- Samita Chakrabarti (Sun)
- John Lesser (UNH)

Mobile IPv6 Base draft – version 15

Total Participants: 10
- 6 HA implementations
- 7 CN implementations
- 3 MN implementations
- 1 protocol analyzer implementation
- 2 Conformance Test implementations

UNH (Tests for CN and Interop)
TAHI (Automated Tests for HA, CN and MN)
Mobile IPv6 Test Results

Results/Issues (Base MIPv6 draft-15):
- No major interoperability issues
- Issues were mailed in the mobile-ip list to resolve them in draft version 16
- 3 implementations had authentication sub-option
- No other security mechanisms were tested/implemented

2 Major issues/questions:
- How useful is “refresh” field in BACK?
  - Removal of “refresh” field saves bits, otherwise more clarification is needed
- Should BACK from HA contain RH when MN de-registers at home network?
  - It makes sense not to include RH in this case.
Mobile IPv6 Test Results

**Fast MIPv6 Handoff draft:**

- 2 implementations
- Ad-hoc testing were performed between these two implementations for mobile node controlled handoffs

Draft issues were not discussed at the Connectathon discussion forum. Issues will be mailed to the mobile-ip list by Alper Yegin.
Mobile IPv4 Testing

MIPv4 Technology Co-ordination: Samita Chakrabarti (Sun)

Total Participants: 6
- 3 FA and HA implementations
- 3 MN implementations
- 1 MIPv4 protocol analyzer implementation

Conformance Tests provided by Sun Microsystems Inc.
Mobile IPv4 Testing

Specifications Tested:
- RFC2002-bis (All vendors)
- RFC3220 (at least 3 implementations)
- RFC3024 (All vendors, but most of them did not implement LPAS feature)
- RFC2794 (All vendors)
- RFC3012 (3 implementors)
- draft-ietf-mobileip-aaa-key-00.txt (2 implementors)
- draft-ietf-mobileip-nat-traversal-00.txt (1 implementation)
Mobile IPv4 Testing

Results and Issues:
- All of them interoperated with each-other
- No major problems or issues
- RFC3220 specification issues were projected at Connectathon discussion forum.

Issues need to be clarified/corrected:
- What error code should a MN receive when it sends multiple MN-HA auth extensions in the regReq?
  Proposal: Poorly formatted request
- Draft should clarify that “Poorly formatted request” should be used in the cases of out-of-order extension headers as well.
- Conflicting statement in 3.7.2.1 of RFC3220
Mobile IP Connectathon Update

Questions?