



# Proxy Mobile IPv6 Extensions to Support Flow Mobility

## draft-ietf-netext-pmipv6-flowmob-04

Carlos J. Bernardos (Ed.) – Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Vancouver, NETEXT WG, 2012-08-02

# Current status since Paris

- Marco and Juan Carlos performed a detailed review of -03 version and posted their comments on the mailing list
  - Thanks for the reviews!
- -04 version addresses their comments, as described in the next slides

# Changes from -03

- [MARCO] “The spec should solely assume that the MN is able to handle multiple addresses@ multiple interfaces as well as to enforce uplink policies to select the right interface” (in relation to the reference to the logical interface)
  - The abstract as well as the rest of the document (e.g., Section 6 on Mobile Node considerations) has been modified
  - The draft references draft-ietf-netext-logical-interface as one possible example

# Changes from -03

- [JUAN CARLOS] “The three numbered scenarios are first described at the initialization point (i.e. attachment), and then the flow mobility use case is described for each one of them below in the text [...] I would suggest describing each scenario in full in each one of the numbered sections”
  - This change has been performed, it also addresses a comment by Marco about the clarity of some text in Section 3

# Changes from -03

- [MARCO] “I propose to just draw the IP box and the two IF boxes. Same for the description below. Much clearer for the reader, as focus is on the infrastructure, not on understanding how the LIF works.” (about Figure 1)
  - This suggested change has been implemented

# Changes from -03

- [MARCO] “The big decision box confuses, IMHO. I'd propose to draw two small boxes, one on the LMA's and another on the MN's line which say 'flow policy update'. That should be clear enough.” (about Figure 2)
  - Change done

# Changes from -03

- [JUAN CARLOS] Several suggested changes about the use of normative language
  - Most of them have been implemented

# Changes from -03

- [MARCO] “I think this should be one of the most important sections of the specification. The protocol operation before should refer to the BCE and the table, where the flow rules are available, and describe the procedure from packet arrival to the release of the encapsulated packet on the wire. What's being looked up first, the Flow Mobility Cache or the BCE?” (about some text in Section 5.2)
  - The draft leverages on RFC6089 operations. Question to the WG: do we want to extend this section, probably re-using text from RFC6089 to explain in detail how this works? Do we want also to include more details in the Sections 3.2.X about how flow routing is performed and how the signaling defined updates the FMC and extended BCE?



# Ideas for Next steps

- Do WGLC in September, hopefully ending up in issuing the draft to the IESG before Atlanta
- Comments/questions?