MPTCP – Multipath TCP

WG Meeting

18th & 20th July 2016

Berlin, Germany

Philip Eardley

Yoshifumi Nishida

- Note taker
- Jabber
  - start your jabber comments with “[mike]” if you want them spoken at the mike
- Please say your name at the mike

Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- **the IETF plenary session,**
- **any IETF working group or portion thereof,**
- **the IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,**
- **the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,**
- **any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,**
- **the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function**

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 3978 (updated by RFC 4748) and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 3978 (and RFC 4748) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

IETF-96

1. Hackathon – any interest?
    1. Saturday July 16, 2016 and Sunday July 17, 2016
2. Applied Networking Research Workshop 2016, Saturday July 16, 2016
    1. An enhanced socket API for Multipath TCP. Full Paper ; Benjamin Hesmans (UCL) and Olivier Bonaventure (UCL).
    2. Towards a Multipath TCP Aware Load Balancer. Short Paper ; Simon Liénardy (Université de Liège) and Benoit Donnet (Université de Liège).
    3. https://irtf.org/anrw/2016/
3. We have two WG sessions
    1. Monday 1540-1740 – Charter items
        1. Implementation news
        2. Bumping the version number
        3. Progressing /finalising rfc6824bis
            1. Alan Ford – draft-ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis
            2. Fabien Duchene - draft-duchene-mptcp-add-addr
    2. Wednesday 1400-1530 –
        1. Continuing Monday's discussion
        2. non-Charter items
        3. (if time) possible re-chartering

Implementation news

Bumping the version number - Introduction

- ? Should rfc6824-bis have:
  - the same version number as rfc6824
  - or a new version number (& deprecate rfc6824)
- History:
  - We had an earlier discussion & decided to bump the version number http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/multipathtcp/current/msg02572.html
  - Further recent discussion at the interim etc https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim-2016-mptcp-01/minutes/minutes-interim-2016-mptcp-01
  - (today) Is there clear consensus to change our decision? (if not, we keep with it)
- Pros
  - We can make MP-CAPABLE reliable
  - Simple to add other new features that seem desirable (support for stateless server, load balancer; save option space in SYN)
- Cons
  - Have to migrate between MPTCP versions
  - New features less important
- Data points
  - Data on importance of making signalling reliable (Christoph Paasch)
  - Are people with deployments worried about the migration issue?

RFC6824bis - Introduction

- Suggested aim is to do (first?) WG last call as soon as possible
- We will need implementation(s) before we forward to IESG
- Alan Ford – draft-ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis
- Fabien Duchene - draft-duchene-mptcp-add-addr

Possible re-chartering - Introduction

- Charter item: MPTCP-enabled middleboxes (Informational)
- Finally, the working group will explore whether an MPTCP-aware middlebox would be useful, where at least one end host is MPTCP-enabled. … The working group will detail what real problems an MPTCP-enabled middlebox might solve, how it would impact the Multipath TCP architecture (RFC6182), what proxy approach might be justified as compared against alternative solutions to the problems, and the likely feasibility of solving the technical and security issues.
- Limited work /individual drafts towards this
- Real-world MPTCP deployments have proxies at both ends (eg CPE & aggregation node are both MPTP-enabled)
- Should we delete the Charter item, or change it?
- Other additional work items?