

Proxy Mobile IPv6

draft-ietf-netlmm-proxymip6-07.txt

Document Status

- We published the -07 version of the document
- The last call on the document was issued and was closed two weeks back.
- We received comments from around 6 people.
- Some minor nits and textual suggestions
- Some editorial and technical comments
- We will discuss the issues in the mailing list and once the issues are resolved, we will post the updated document for AD's review.

Changes in -07 version of the document

- Multi-Homing Support. New options and processing rules related multi-homing.
- Official review comments received on the -05 version of the document (The Pre Last Call, as the authors say). Comments from Pete, Kilian, Suresh, Ved, Vidya, Ahmad, Julien and many others.
- Addressed other nits and editorial comments.

LC Comments

- Handoff Indicator flag bits
- Missing check related to Access Technology Type option in multi-homing section and some typos
- List of options in PBU/PBA formats. Missing Access Tech Type and Interface Id options
- Apply the MUST rule for the Destination Address selection in the PBA.
- Alt-CoA option considerations
- Specify the exact timeout values in some cases
- Access Technology Type Registry and IANA considerations
- How does the LMA identify the mobile node – clarification
- Create BU List Entry, right after sending the PBU

LC Comments – Policy Profile

- The Document should not have reference to policy profile.

“Can we just say that how the MAG knows this set of parameters is out of the scope of the base specification and may be deployment specific? The problem I have with the terminology in the draft is that it seems that the policy profile solves the issue of providing the MAG with the parameters but actually it does not”

LC Comments – Multi-homing Section

- The LMA PBU processing rules related to multi-homing should not be in a separate section. It should be in one place. Its missing the hierarchy.

LC Comments – Use of Protocol Variables

- Specify the exact value for the timeouts in the multi-homing considerations

LC Comments – Use of MN-Id

- The Document should not mandate the need for MN-Id option presence in all signaling messages.

“I had challenged this before the WG last call and there was no response. Why can't we rely on out-of band HNP assignment, such that HNP is present in all PBUs and that's the key for locating the BCE?”

Input from the AD on the related thread:

“FWIW, I also did not see very convincing reasons why there would be a need to avoid having the identity in every signaling message. Or vice versa. But in general, you SHOULD attempt to identify the parties involved in the transactions as uniquely and consistently as possible. And simplicity is a good thing, so I don't see the identifiers appearing in every message as a bad thing ... <snip>...”

Thank You

