

The Return of the Unified CPE?

draft-ietf-softwire-unified-cpe

M. Boucadair, I. Farrer, S. Perreault,
S. Sivakumar

IETF 90, , March 2014

A Lot of Changes in Softwire Provisioning in the Last Year...

- Since this draft was last discussed, there's been a lot of changes in the mechanism for provisioning softwires
- The unified CPE draft has since expired
- But, the problem still remains:

When both the client and the SP support multiple softwire mechanisms, how does the SP indicate which one to configure?

Is the Unified CPE Still Necessary?

- DS-Lite is quite extensively implemented in HGWs (any HGW implementing RFC6204/7084)
- Any operator with deployed RFC6204 devices, wishing to migrate to using A+P based softwires (MAP-x, 4rd, lw4o6) potentially has this problem
- If two or more A+P mechanism are supported, then the fun really starts.

Current Unified CPE Draft:

Uses a mechanism based on the combinations of software DHCP options requested by the client:

DHCP Option	Stateful Mode	Binding Mode	Stateless Mode
OPTION_AFTR_NAME	Yes	Yes	Yes
Binding Option(s)	No	Yes	No
OPTION_MAP_RULE	No	No	Yes
OPTION_MAP_PORTPARAMS	No	Optional	Optional

However,

- Completely unaligned with the map-dhcp container approach
- Doesn't work if the client and SP support multiple 'modes' (Without server side logic to determine what to provision)

So.....

- Do we need to update this?
- Should we start again using a different mechanism?
- Is anyone else interested in working on this?