Stable Connectivity

IETF 94 11/2015 Yokohama

draft-eckert-anima-stable-connectivity-02

T.Eckert

M. Behringer

Changes since IETF93 (1)

- ACP requirements: IPv6 sufficient

  - -00/01 already covered range of workarounds connecting IPv4 only NOC equipment to IPv6 only ACP

  - Raised discussion about IPv4 for ACP on mailing list.

  - Added section why IPv6 is sufficient:

  - Want to focus on long term simplicity

  - Using single address family is goal of most operator

  - Having dual AF in ACP increases its complexity

  - IPv4 will become service over IPv6 mid-term

  - Goal of draft is to support/encourage mid/long-term targets – and document short-term options via workaround

    - Customers who might need to use drafts "NAT" options to connect IPv4 today may not need it anymore in 1 year from now (moved to IPv6).

Changes since IETF93 (2)

- ## ULA discussion

  - Refined test discussing ULA

  - Original discussion from interest in ULA-C raised by Michael R.

    - How to recognize "leaked" ACP packets (who owns ACP using them).

  - Added text to explain ability to "register" voluntary ULAs today.

    - Registration != allocation.

  - ULA-C would provide authoritative "registration"

    - Might still be done with ULA

    - How important ? Author thinks now it is not crucial

  - Impact of evolving ACP drafts:

    - Making ACP required in anima decreases / eliminates likelyhood that ACP packets leak unexpectedly!

Next steps ?!

Discuss use case suggestion with MIF WG

Review/Opinions. How easy/difficult do other experts feel it is to put MP-TCP on one interface in the ACP and one in the data-plane (as suggested by draft).

Call for WG adoptions ?!

Thank You