

Status Update

draft-ietf-mip6-mipext-advapi-03.txt

Samita.Chakrabarti@sun.com
Erik.Nordmark@sun.com

Document Status

- AD review comments received in Jan 26, 2005
- Minor issues raised
- Evaluation suggests editorial modifications
- 3 Last Call issues in the Issue Tracker – Resolved
- New I-D will be published to address Thomas Narten's comments along with fixes for remaining LC issues

-Expected submission in next few weeks

- Authors are working with WG Chairs and Thomas for suggested editorial changes
- NEMO related API will not be part of this document

Issue Discussion

- LC remaining issues (<http://www.mip4.org/issues/mip6>)
 - Should NEMO API be part of this document? (Issue 13) by Ryuji Wakikawa

Chairs Recommendation:

NEMO WG to add NEMO specific aspects in a separate document

- Editorial fixes suggested by Mark Borst (Issue 10)
- Typo in ip6_mh_home_test structure by Ville Nuorvala (Issue 12)

```
struct ip6_mh ip6mht_hdr -> struct ip6_mh ip6mhht_hdr
```

AD Evaluation and Text Changes

- High Level Comment

Introduction to add a clearer applicability paragraph for target applications and user-level implementations of Mobile IPv6

- Other Comments

This document to state that more API work is needed for socket apps – such as “use COA instead my Home Address”

It is addressed in draft-chakrabarti-ipv6-addrselect-api-02.txt

AD Evaluation and Text Changes

- Other Comments

Either remove paragraph on “appropriate standardization body to standardize” or reword as IPv6 advanced Socket API has not been picked up for “standardization”

More clarification on source address value returned by recv*(), accept(), getpeername() functions by the socket API when Home Address Option is present on the received packet

Reword/clarify the paragraph for IPv4-Mapped address support for this API

Rest of the comments are on editorial nits

Implementation Note

- This I-D requires implementation information to make progress
- Any implementations on this draft ? (HUT ? , Wide?)
- Implementors please contact the authors and Chairs for sharing implementation experience on this draft
- NOTE : This document is targeting an Informational RFC after addressing the AD evaluation comments