IETF 90 Netext notes

WG Status

10 RFC published, last on was RFC 7222

5 remaining, 2 of which are in IESG

Flowmob, pmip-wifi qos has had multiple revisions and discussion. Quite stable.

ANI-location needs reviews from the group.

Juan-Carlos (J-C): logical interface draft is missing. Reason?
Chairs: not of interest (chairs decision), no activity on the mailing list.
If that changes, we can revisit

J-C: disagree on perception of progress. There is running code and demos.
e-mail was not active since understanding was that the decision was not to progress.
but, this is a wg document and should reflect consensus – it should progress

Sri: document history – mobile node to HO over – there were gaps. This was chosen by the group to progress the work. It was only one individual commenter (Julien) that held the work up. All issues in the issue tracker were handled.

Brian (AD): shepherding AD.
who has read this document (other than doc editors/chairs?
Charlie: read it a long time ago, not much in favor or against.
J-C: in 3GPP SA2 – discussions on IP flow mobility, and it is coming back. This draft is mentioned in the contributions.
Rajeev: there is renewed interest in 3GPP – but it has no relevance to this draft.
3GPP is doing it without this draft.

Brian: because asking for publication is a wg activity, are there 3 volunteers to review
send an e-mail to chair, and this will be indication to chair to see this published.

Sri: can we move this to dmm?
Brian: do you see this as mobility specific?
Sri: it is related to aspects in mobility.
Brian: historically, such drafts have been implementations. But, will this be interoperable across various access technologies.
Sri: it is operable across RATs, but there is some complexities in IPv6

Brian: will the group of reviewers change across netext or dmm..
Sri: reviews are a general problem, but should be no difference
Brian: if mobility community is interested, then we can look at it.
Chair: any requirement/suggestion on reviewers?
Brian: ideally everyone. But, in practice – detailed and thorough reviews.

Proxy Mobile Extensions for Flow Mobility (Carlos)

Version 10. Pending issue : inclusion of flow identification option in the signaling.
Should it be back in the signaling (wg opinion)?
No opposition in WG.
Will put it back n the draft.

Document ready for WGLC?

Rajeev:
1. in the figures (e..g 2) – arrows are bidirectional. It is confusing. Unidirectional to show sequence better.
2. Qn from Behcet (relayed by chair)
Where is the flow mobility protocol?
(captured in last para – see draft): revise to make the requirement clear in the last para.
Why is LMA prefix allocation policy a flow mobility protocol issue?
(answer) Carlos: it is for supporting different deployment models.
Chiar: does the WG agree with this interpretation?
WG has no objection with the above interpretation.

- Update draft in Section 4: normative dependency on RFC 7077 – refer to 4.2

Chair: when for version 12.
Author: next week.

PMIP QoS in WiFi domain

Chair: has been reviewed and ready for last call?

ANI Extensions

Chair: needs more reviews before last call

AD Comment:

Not a number of reviews for documents.

WG last call should have reviews on documents. The quality of documents should be good, and will help with the process of wrapping this up.

Charlie: people usually are motivated to review after going to the WG meeting. What happens since the WG is closing – will the docs remain in limbo?

AD: Not a fan of consensus by silence. The community of people that want it published should take the effort to have it reviewed.