NSIS Mobility discussion



Authors:

Jongho Bang, Roland Bless, Xiaoming Fu, Robert Hancock, Jin Pyo Hong, Seong-Ho Jeong, Cornelia Kappler, Byoung-Joon Lee, Sung-Hyuck Lee, Jukka Manner, Paulo Mendes, Andrew McDonald, Henning Schulzrinne, Charles Shen, Hannes Tschofenig

Non-goals

- Not designing a mobility protocol
- Not designing a separate NSIS mobility protocol
- Not repeating work already done in IETF mobility-related WGs
- Not integrate NSIS and existing mobility protocols
- Not a long term research activity
 - ñ Provide input to protocol design over the coming months
 - \tilde{n} Don't expect the design work to wait

Motivation

Avoid initial design mistakes that break the protocols in mobile environments, e.g.

- $\tilde{\mathsf{n}}$ Tie signaling application states with IP addresses
- $\tilde{\mathsf{n}}$ Tie routing state to session identifier
- ^ñ Probably more similar issues exist, a detailed analysis of the problem area is needed (much done already, still uncoordinated)

Mobility problems are very hard to patch after initial design and deployment

ñ Because they have interactions spread across the network

Main Issues in Scope

Differences between the general route change and mobility-caused route change

Discovery of crossover router and dead peers

How to set up states on the new path and tear down old states on the obsolete path? When?

State update on the common path after handover

Interactions with mobility protocols, using MIP, LMM, SIP, CT and CARD as examples

Dependencies between the NTLP and NSLP and split of functionality between layers

Security issues, e.g. the authorization model

Out of Scope Issues

Specific implementation details (generic guidelines would be in scope)

Mobility (routing) management

Handover management: requirements for NTLP/NSLP state management in scope

Movement detection of end hosts and finding candidate access routers

Multicast without limits, "SSM could be tbd"

How to Proceed?

- Do we need a single document? Yes.
- Does the document need to be accepted by the WG?
- Does it therefore need to be a WG document?
- Does it need to be a charter item? No?
- Document status in the short and long term:
 - ñ Give input/validation for the current protocol design,
 complete basic issues by Spring -04
 - ñ Gather guidelines for designers of future NSLP protocols
 - ñ Give guidelines for implementors of signaling applications