

DMM Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Experimental  
Expires: May 5, 2020

CJ. Bernardos  
A. de la Oliva  
UC3M  
F. Giust  
Athonet  
JC. Zuniga  
SIGFOX  
A. Mourad  
InterDigital  
November 2, 2019

**Proxy Mobile IPv6 extensions for Distributed Mobility Management  
draft-ietf-dmm-pmipv6-dlif-05**

Abstract

Distributed Mobility Management solutions allow for setting up networks so that traffic is distributed in an optimal way and does not rely on centrally deployed anchors to provide IP mobility support.

There are many different approaches to address Distributed Mobility Management, as for example extending network-based mobility protocols (like Proxy Mobile IPv6), or client-based mobility protocols (like Mobile IPv6), among others. This document follows the former approach and proposes a solution based on Proxy Mobile IPv6 in which mobility sessions are anchored at the last IP hop router (called mobility anchor and access router). The mobility anchor and access router is an enhanced access router which is also able to operate as a local mobility anchor or mobility access gateway, on a per prefix basis. The document focuses on the required extensions to effectively support simultaneously anchoring several flows at different distributed gateways.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 5, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#) . . . . . [3](#)
- [2. Terminology](#) . . . . . [4](#)
- [3. PMIPv6 DMM extensions](#) . . . . . [5](#)
  - [3.1. Initial registration](#) . . . . . [7](#)
  - [3.2. The CMD as PBU/PBA relay](#) . . . . . [8](#)
  - [3.3. The CMD as MAAR locator](#) . . . . . [11](#)
  - [3.4. The CMD as MAAR proxy](#) . . . . . [12](#)
  - [3.5. De-registration](#) . . . . . [13](#)
  - [3.6. The Distributed Logical Interface \(DLIF\) concept](#) . . . . . [14](#)
- [4. Message Format](#) . . . . . [18](#)
  - [4.1. Proxy Binding Update](#) . . . . . [18](#)
  - [4.2. Proxy Binding Acknowledgment](#) . . . . . [19](#)
  - [4.3. Anchored Prefix Option](#) . . . . . [19](#)
  - [4.4. Local Prefix Option](#) . . . . . [20](#)
  - [4.5. Previous MAAR Option](#) . . . . . [22](#)
  - [4.6. Serving MAAR Option](#) . . . . . [23](#)
  - [4.7. DLIF Link-local Address Option](#) . . . . . [23](#)
  - [4.8. DLIF Link-layer Address Option](#) . . . . . [24](#)
- [5. IANA Considerations](#) . . . . . [25](#)



<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">25</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgments . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	<a href="#">Comparison with Requirement document . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">A.1.</a>	<a href="#">Distributed mobility management . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
A.2.	<a href="#">Bypassable network-layer mobility support for each application session . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">A.3.</a>	<a href="#">IPv6 deployment . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">29</a>
<a href="#">A.4.</a>	<a href="#">Existing mobility protocols . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">29</a>
A.5.	<a href="#">Coexistence with deployed networks/hosts and operability across different networks . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">29</a>
<a href="#">A.6.</a>	<a href="#">Operation and management considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">A.7.</a>	<a href="#">Security considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">A.8.</a>	<a href="#">Multicast considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">Appendix B.</a>	<a href="#">Implementation experience . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">32</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

The Distributed Mobility Management (DMM) paradigm aims at minimizing the impact of currently standardized mobility management solutions which are centralized (at least to a considerable extent).

Current IP mobility solutions, standardized with the names of Mobile IPv6 [[RFC6275](#)], or Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) [[RFC5213](#)], just to cite the two most relevant examples, offer mobility support at the cost of handling operations at a cardinal point, the mobility anchor (i.e., the home agent for Mobile IPv6, and the local mobility anchor for Proxy Mobile IPv6), and burdening it with data forwarding and control mechanisms for a great amount of users. As stated in [[RFC7333](#)], centralized mobility solutions are prone to several problems and limitations: longer (sub-optimal) routing paths, scalability problems, signaling overhead (and most likely a longer associated handover latency), more complex network deployment, higher vulnerability due to the existence of a potential single point of failure, and lack of granularity of the mobility management service (i.e., mobility is offered on a per-node basis, not being possible to define finer granularity policies, as for example per-application).

The purpose of Distributed Mobility Management is to overcome the limitations of the traditional centralized mobility management [[RFC7333](#)] [[RFC7429](#)]; the main concept behind DMM solutions is indeed bringing the mobility anchor closer to the Mobile Node (MN). Following this idea, in our proposal, the central anchor is moved to the edge of the network, being deployed in the default gateway of the mobile node. That is, the first elements that provide IP



connectivity to a set of MNs are also the mobility managers for those MNs. In this document, we call these entities Mobility Anchors and Access Routers (MAARs).

This document focuses on network-based DMM, hence the starting point is making PMIPv6 work in a distributed manner [[RFC7429](#)]. Mobility is handled by the network without the MNs involvement, but, differently from PMIPv6, when the MN moves from one access network to another, it may also change anchor router, hence requiring signaling between the anchors to retrieve the MN's previous location(s). Also, a key-aspect of network-based DMM, is that a prefix pool belongs exclusively to each MAAR, in the sense that those prefixes are assigned by the MAAR to the MNs attached to it, and they are routable at that MAAR.

We consider partially distributed schemes, where the data plane only is distributed among access routers similar to MAGs, whereas the control plane is kept centralized towards a cardinal node used as information store, but relieved from any route management and MN's data forwarding task.

## 2. Terminology

The following terms used in this document are defined in the Proxy Mobile IPv6 specification [[RFC5213](#)]:

Local Mobility Anchor (LMA)

Mobile Access Gateway (MAG)

Mobile Node (MN)

Binding Cache Entry (BCE)

Proxy Care-of Address (P-CoA)

Proxy Binding Update (PBU)

Proxy Binding Acknowledgement (PBA)

The following terms used in this document are defined in the DMM Deployment Models and Architectural Considerations document [[I-D.ietf-dmm-deployment-models](#)]:

Home Control-Plane Anchor (Home-CPA)

Home Data Plane Anchor (Home-DPA)



Access Control Plane Node (Access-CPN)

Access Data Plane Node (Access-DPN)

The following terms are defined and used in this document:

MAAR (Mobility Anchor and Access Router). First hop router where the mobile nodes attach to. It also plays the role of mobility manager for the IPv6 prefixes it anchors, running the functionalities of PMIP's MAG and LMA. Depending on the prefix, it plays the role of Access-DPN, Home-DPA and Access-CPN.

CMD (Central Mobility Database). The node that stores the BCEs allocated for the MNs in the mobility domain. It plays the role of Home-CPA.

P-MAAR (Previous MAAR). When a MN moves to a new point of attachment a new MAAR might be allocated as its anchor point for future IPv6 prefixes. The MAAR that served the MN prior to new attachment becomes the P-MAAR. It is still the anchor point for the IPv6 prefixes it had allocated to the MN in the past and serves as the Home-DPA for flows using these prefixes. There might be several P-MAARs serving a MN when the MN is frequently switching points of attachment while maintaining long-lasting flows.

S-MAAR (Serving MAAR). The MAAR which the MN is currently attached to. Depending on the prefix, it plays the role of Access-DPN, Home-DPA and Access-CPN.

DLIF (Distributed Logical Interface). It is a logical interface at the IP stack of the MAAR. For each active prefix used by the MN, the S-MAAR has a DLIF configured (associated to each MAAR still anchoring flows). In this way, an S-MAAR exposes itself towards each MN as multiple routers, one as itself and one per P-MAAR.

### **3. PMIPv6 DMM extensions**

The solution consists of de-coupling the entities that participate in the data and the control planes: the data plane becomes distributed and managed by the MAARs near the edge of the network, while the control plane, besides those on the MAARs, relies on a central entity called Central Mobility Database (CMD). In the proposed architecture, the hierarchy present in PMIPv6 between LMA and MAG is preserved, but with the following substantial variations:

- o The LMA is relieved from the data forwarding role, only the Binding Cache and its management operations are maintained. Hence the LMA is renamed into Central Mobility Database (CMD), which is





therefore a Home-CPA. Also, the CMD is able to send and parse both PBU and PBA messages.

- o The MAG is enriched with the LMA functionalities, hence the name Mobility Anchor and Access Router (MAAR). It maintains a local Binding Cache for the MNs that are attached to it and it is able to send and parse PBU and PBA messages.
- o The binding cache will be extended to include information regarding P-MAARs where the mobile node was anchored and still retains active data sessions, see [Appendix B](#) for further details.
- o Each MAAR has a unique set of global prefixes (which are configurable), that can be allocated by the MAAR to the MNs, but must be exclusive to that MAAR, i.e. no other MAAR can allocate the same prefixes.

The MAARs leverage the Central Mobility Database (CMD) to access and update information related to the MNs, stored as mobility sessions; hence, a centralized node maintains a global view of the network status. The CMD is queried whenever a MN is detected to join/leave the mobility domain. It might be a fresh attachment, a detachment or a handover, but as MAARs are not aware of past information related to a mobility session, they contact the CMD to retrieve the data of interest and eventually take the appropriate action. The procedure adopted for the query and the messages exchange sequence might vary to optimize the update latency and/or the signaling overhead. Here is presented one method for the initial registration, and three different approaches for updating the mobility sessions using PBUs and PBAs. Each approach assigns a different role to the CMD:

- o The CMD is a PBU/PBA relay;
- o The CMD is only a MAAR locator;
- o The CMD is a PBU/PBA proxy.

This solution can be categorized under Model-1: Split Home Anchor Mode in [[I-D.ietf-dmm-deployment-models](#)]. As another note, the solution described in this document allows performing per-prefix anchoring decisions, to support e.g., some flows to be anchored at a central Home-DPA (like a traditional LMA) or to enable an application to switch to the locally anchored prefix to gain route optimization, as indicated in [[RFC8563](#)]. This type of per-prefix treatment would potentially require additional extensions to the MAARs and signaling between the MAARs and the MNs to convey the per-flow anchor preference (central, distributed), which are not covered in this document.



Note that a MN MAY move across different MAARs, which might result in several P-MAARs existing at a given moment of time, each of them anchoring a different prefix used by the MN.

### **3.1. Initial registration**

Initial registration is performed when an MN attaches to a network for the first time (rather than attaching to a new network after moving from a previous one).

In this description (shown in Figure 1), it is assumed that:

1. The MN is attaching to MAAR1.
2. The MN is authorized to attach to the network.

Upon MN attachment, the following operations take place:

1. MAAR1 assigns an IPv6 global prefix from its own prefix pool to the MN (Pref1). It also stores this prefix (Pref1) in the locally allocated temporary Binding Cache Entry (BCE).
2. MAAR1 sends a PBU [[RFC5213](#)] with Pref1 and the MN's MN-ID to the CMD.
3. Since this is an initial registration, the CMD stores a permanent BCE containing as primary fields the MN-ID, Pref1 and MAAR1's address as a Proxy-CoA.
4. The CMD replies with a PBA with the usual options defined in PMIPv6 [[RFC5213](#)], meaning that the MN's registration is fresh and no past status is available.
5. MAAR1 stores the BCE described in (1) and unicasts a Router Advertisement (RA) to the MN with Pref1.
6. The MN uses Pref1 to configure an IPv6 address (IP1) (e.g., with stateless auto-configuration, SLAAC).

Note that:

1. Alternative IPv6 auto-configuration mechanisms can also be used, though this document describes the SLAAC-based one.
2. IP1 is routable at MAAR1, in the sense that it is on the path of packets addressed to the MN.



- 3. MAAR1 acts as a plain router for packets destined to the MN, as no encapsulation nor special handling takes place.

In the diagram shown in Figure 1 (and subsequent diagrams), the flow of packets is presented using '\*'.




Figure 1: First attachment to the network

Note that the registration process does not change regardless of the CMD's modes (relay, locator or proxy) described next. The procedure is depicted in Figure 1.

### 3.2. The CMD as PBU/PBA relay

Upon MN mobility, if the CMD behaves as PBU/PBA relay, the following operations take place:

1. When the MN moves from its current point of attachment and attaches to MAAR2 (now the S-MAAR), MAAR2 reserves another IPv6 prefix (Pref2), it stores a temporary BCE, and it sends a plain PBU to the CMD for registration.
2. Upon PBU reception and BC lookup, the CMD retrieves an already existing entry for the MN, binding the MN-ID to its former location; thus, the CMD forwards the PBU to the MAAR indicated as



Proxy CoA (MAAR1), including a new mobility option to communicate the S-MAAR's global address to MAAR1, defined as Serving MAAR Option in [Section 4.6](#). The CMD updates the P-CoA field in the BCE related to the MN with the S-MAAR's address.

3. Upon PBU reception, MAAR1 can install a tunnel on its side towards MAAR2 and the related routes for Pref1. Then MAAR1 replies to the CMD with a PBA (including the option mentioned before) to ensure that the new location has successfully changed, containing the prefix anchored at MAAR1 in the Home Network Prefix option.
4. The CMD, after receiving the PBA, updates the BCE populating an instance of the P-MAAR list. The P-MAAR list is an additional field on the BCE that contains an element for each P-MAAR involved in the MN's mobility session. The list element contains the P-MAAR's global address and the prefix it has delegated (see [Appendix B](#) for further details). Also, the CMD sends a PBA to the new S-MAAR, containing the previous Proxy-CoA and the prefix anchored to it embedded into a new mobility option called Previous MAAR Option (defined in [Section 4.5](#)), so that, upon PBA arrival, a bi-directional tunnel can be established between the two MAARs and new routes are set appropriately to recover the IP flow(s) carrying Pref1.
5. Now packets destined to Pref1 are first received by MAAR1, encapsulated into the tunnel and forwarded to MAAR2, which finally delivers them to their destination. In uplink, when the MN transmits packets using Pref1 as source address, they are sent to MAAR2, as it is MN's new default gateway, then tunneled to MAAR1 which routes them towards the next hop to destination. Conversely, packets carrying Pref2 are routed by MAAR2 without any special packet handling both for uplink and downlink.









(to retransmit PBUs). The INITIAL\_BINDACK\_TIMEOUT [[RFC6275](#)] SHOULD be used for configuring the retransmission timer.

When there are multiple previous MAARs, e.g., k MAARs, a single PBU received by the CMD triggers k outgoing packets from a single incoming packet. This may lead to packet bursts originated from the CMD, albeit to different targets. Pacing mechanisms MAY be introduced to avoid bursts on the outgoing link.


### **3.3. The CMD as MAAR locator**

The handover latency experienced in the approach shown before can be reduced if the P-MAARs are allowed to signal directly their information to the new S-MAAR. This procedure reflects what was described in [Section 3.2](#) up to the moment the P-MAAR receives the PBU with the P-MAAR option. At that point a P-MAAR is aware of the new MN's location (because of the S-MAAR's address in the S-MAAR option), and, besides sending a PBA to the CMD, it also sends a PBA to the S-MAAR including the prefix it is anchoring. This latter PBA does not need to include new options, as the prefix is embedded in the HNP option and the P-MAAR's address is taken from the message's source address. The CMD is relieved from forwarding the PBA to the S-MAAR, as the latter receives a copy directly from the P-MAAR with the necessary information to build the tunnels and set the appropriate routes. Figure 3 illustrates the new message sequence, while the data forwarding is unaltered.









Operations sequence  
PBU/PBA Messages with \* contain  
a new mobility option

Data Packets flow

Figure 4: Scenario after a handover, CMD as proxy

### 3.5. De-registration

The de-registration mechanism devised for PMIPv6 cannot be used as is in this solution. The reason for this is that each MAAR handles an independent mobility session (i.e., a single or a set of prefixes) for a given MN, whereas the aggregated session is stored at the CMD. Indeed, when a previous MAAR initiates a de-registration procedure, because the MN is no longer present on the MAAR's access link, it removes the routing state for that (those) prefix(es), that would be deleted by the CMD as well, hence defeating any prefix continuity attempt. The simplest approach to overcome this limitation is to deny a P-MAAR to de-register a prefix, that is, allowing only a serving MAAR to de-register the whole MN session. This can be achieved by first removing any layer-2 detachment event, so that de-registration is triggered only when the session lifetime expires, hence providing a guard interval for the MN to connect to a new MAAR. Then, a change in the MAAR operations is required, and at this stage two possible solutions can be deployed:

- o A previous MAAR stops the BCE timer upon receiving a PBU from the CMD containing a "Serving MAAR" option. In this way only the





Serving MAAR is allowed to de-register the mobility session, arguing that the MN definitely left the domain.

- o Previous MAARs can, upon BCE expiry, send de-registration messages to the CMD, which, instead of acknowledging the message with a 0 lifetime, sends back a PBA with a non-zero lifetime, hence re-newing the session, if the MN is still connected to the domain.

**3.6. The Distributed Logical Interface (DLIF) concept**

One of the main challenges of a network-based DMM solution is how to allow a mobile node to simultaneously send/receive traffic which is anchored at different MAARs, and how to influence the mobile node's selection process of its source IPv6 address for a new flow, without requiring special support from the mobile node's IP stack. This document defines the Distributed Logical Interface (DLIF), which is a software construct that allows to easily hide the change of associated anchors from the mobile node.




Figure 5: DLIF: exposing multiple routers (one per P-MAAR)

The basic idea of the DLIF concept is the following: each serving MAAR exposes itself towards a given MN as multiple routers, one per P-MAAR associated to the MN. Let's consider the example shown in Figure 5, MN1 initially attaches to MAAR1, configuring an IPv6



address (prefA::MN1) from a prefix locally anchored at MAAR1 (prefA::/64). At this stage, MAAR1 plays both the role of anchoring and serving MAAR, and also behaves as a plain IPv6 access router. MAAR1 creates a distributed logical interface to communicate (point-to-point link) with MN1, exposing itself as a (logical) router with a specific MAC (e.g., 00:11:22:33:01:01) and IPv6 addresses (e.g., prefA::MAAR1/64 and fe80:211:22ff:fe33:101/64) using the DLIF mn1mar1. As explained below, these addresses represent the "logical" identity of MAAR1 towards MN1, and will "follow" the mobile node while roaming within the domain (note that the place where all this information is maintained and updated is out-of-scope of this draft; potential examples are to keep it on the home subscriber server -- HSS -- or the user's profile).

If MN1 moves and attaches to a different MAAR of the domain (MAAR2 in the example of Figure 5), this MAAR will create a new logical interface (mn1mar2) to expose itself towards MN1, providing it with a locally anchored prefix (prefB::/64). In this case, since the MN1 has another active IPv6 address anchored at a MAAR1, MAAR2 also needs to create an additional logical interface configured to exactly resemble the one used by MAAR1 to communicate with MN1. In this example, there is only one P-MAAR (in addition to MAAR2, which is the serving one): MAAR1, so only the logical interface mn1mar1 is created, but the same process would be repeated in case there were more P-MAARs involved. In order to maintain the prefix anchored at MAAR1 reachable, a tunnel between MAAR1 and MAAR2 is established and the routing is modified accordingly. The PBU/PBA signaling is used to set-up the bi-directional tunnel between MAAR1 and MAAR2, and it might also be used to convey to MAAR2 the information about the prefix(es) anchored at MAAR1 and about the addresses of the associated DLIF (i.e., mn1mar1).






Figure 6: Distributed Logical Interface concept

Figure 6 shows the logical interface concept in more detail. The figure shows two MAARs and three MNs. MAAR1 is currently serving MN2 and MN3, while MAAR2 is serving MN1. MN1, MN2 and MN3 have two P-MAARs: MAAR1 and MAAR2. Note that a serving MAAR always plays the role of anchoring MAAR for the attached (served) MNs. Each MAAR has one single physical wireless interface.

As introduced before, each MN always "sees" multiple logical routers -- one per P-MAAR -- independently of its currently serving MAAR. From the point of view of the MN, these MAARs are portrayed as different routers, although the MN is physically attached to one single interface. The way this is achieved is by the serving MAAR configuring different logical interfaces. Focusing on MN1, it is currently attached to MAAR2 (i.e., MAAR2 is its serving MAAR) and, therefore, it has configured an IPv6 address from MAAR2's pool (e.g., prefB::/64). MAAR2 has set-up a logical interface (mn1mar2) on top of its wireless physical interface (phy if MAAR2) which is used to serve MN1. This interface has a logical MAC address (LMAC6), different from the hardware MAC address (HMAC2) of the physical interface of MAAR2. Over the mn1mar2 interface, MAAR2 advertises its locally anchored prefix prefB::/64. Before attaching to MAAR2, MN1 was attached to MAAR1, configuring also an address locally anchored at that MAAR, which is still being used by MN1 in active communications. MN1 keeps "seeing" an interface connecting to MAAR1, as if it were directly connected to the two MAARs. This is achieved



by the serving MAAR (MAAR2) configuring an additional distributed logical interface: `mn1mar1`, which behaves exactly as the logical interface configured by MAAR1 when MN1 was attached to it. This means that both the MAC and IPv6 addresses configured on this logical interface remain the same regardless of the physical MAAR which is serving the MN. The information required by a serving MAAR to properly configure this logical interfaces can be obtained in different ways: as part of the information conveyed in the PBA, from an external database (e.g., the HSS) or by other means. As shown in the figure, each MAAR may have several logical interfaces associated to each attached MN, having always at least one (since a serving MAAR is also an anchoring MAAR for the attached MN).

In order to enforce the use of the prefix locally anchored at the serving MAAR, the router advertisements sent over those logical interfaces playing the role of anchoring MAARs (different from the serving one) include a zero preferred prefix lifetime (and a non-zero valid prefix lifetime, so the prefix remains valid, while being deprecated). The goal is to deprecate the prefixes delegated by these MAARs (which will be no longer serving the MN). Note that on-going communications may keep on using those addresses, even if they are deprecated, so this only affects the establishment of new sessions.

The distributed logical interface concept also enables the following use case: suppose that access to a local IP network is provided by a given MAAR (e.g., MAAR1 in the example shown in Figure 5) and that the resources available at that network cannot be reached from outside the local network (e.g., cannot be accessed by an MN attached to MAAR2). This is similar to the local IP access scenario considered by 3GPP, where a local gateway node is selected for sessions requiring access to services provided locally (instead of going through a central gateway). The goal is to allow an MN to be able to roam while still being able to have connectivity to this local IP network. The solution adopted to support this case makes use of [RFC 4191](#) [[RFC4191](#)] more specific routes when the MN moves to a MAAR different from the one providing access to the local IP network (MAAR1 in the example). These routes are advertised through the distributed logical interface representing the MAAR providing access to the local network (MAAR1 in this example). In this way, if MN1 moves from MAAR1 to MAAR2, any active session that MN1 may have with a node on the local network connected to MAAR1 will survive via the tunnel between MAAR1 and MAAR2. Also, any potential future connection attempt towards the local network will be supported, even though MN1 is no longer attached to MAAR1.










### 4.2. Proxy Binding Acknowledgment

A new flag (D) is included in the Proxy Binding Acknowledgment to indicate that the sender supports operating as a Mobility Anchor and Access Router. The rest of the Proxy Binding Acknowledgment format remains the same as defined in [RFC5213].



MAAR (D)

The D is set to indicate that the sender of the message supports operating as a Mobility Anchor and Access Router. When a MAG that does not support the extensions described in this document receives a message with the D-Flag set, it MUST ignore the message and an error MUST be returned.

#### Mobility Options


Variable-length field of such length that the complete Mobility Header is an integer multiple of 8 octets long. This field contains zero or more TLV-encoded mobility options. The encoding and format of defined options are described in [Section 6.2 of \[RFC6275\]](#). The MAAR MUST ignore and skip any options that it does not understand.

### 4.3. Anchored Prefix Option

A new Anchored Prefix option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Update and Proxy Binding Acknowledgment messages exchanged between MAARs and CMDs. Therefore, this option can only appear if the D bit is set in a PBU/PBA. This option is used for exchanging the mobile node's prefix anchored at the anchoring MAAR. There can be multiple Anchored Prefix options present in the message.



The Anchored Prefix Option has an alignment requirement of 8n+4. Its format is as follows:



Type

IANA-1.

Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the length of the option in octets, excluding the type and length fields. This field MUST be set to 18.

Reserved

This field is unused for now. The value MUST be initialized to 0 by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

Prefix Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the prefix length of the IPv6 prefix contained in the option.

Anchored Prefix

A sixteen-byte field containing the mobile node's IPv6 Anchored Prefix. Only the first Prefix Length bytes are valid for the Anchored Prefix. The rest of the bytes MUST be ignored.


**4.4. Local Prefix Option**

A new Local Prefix option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Update and Proxy Binding Acknowledgment messages exchanged between MAARs. Therefore, this option can only appear if the D bit is set in



a PBU/PBA. This option is used for exchanging a prefix of a local network that is only reachable via the anchoring MAAR. There can be multiple Local Prefix options present in the message.

The Local Prefix Option has an alignment requirement of 8n+4. Its format is as follows:



Type

IANA-2.

Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the length of the option in octets, excluding the type and length fields. This field MUST be set to 18.

Reserved

This field is unused for now. The value MUST be initialized to 0 by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

Prefix Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the prefix length of the IPv6 prefix contained in the option.

Local Prefix


A sixteen-byte field containing the IPv6 Local Prefix. Only the first Prefix Length bytes are valid for the IPv6 Local Prefix. The rest of the bytes MUST be ignored.





4.5. Previous MAAR Option

This new option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Acknowledgement messages exchanged by the CMD to a MAAR. This option is used to notify the S-MAAR about the previous MAAR's global address and the prefix anchored to it. There can be multiple Previous MAAR options present in the message. Its format is as follows:



Type

IANA-3.

Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the length of the option in octets, excluding the type and length fields. This field MUST be set to 33.

Prefix Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the prefix length of the IPv6 prefix contained in the option.

Previous MAAR's address

A sixteen-byte field containing the P-MAAR's IPv6 global address.




Home Network Prefix

A sixteen-byte field containing the mobile node's IPv6 Home Network Prefix. Only the first Prefix Length bytes are valid for the mobile node's IPv6 Home Network Prefix. The rest of the bytes MUST be ignored.

4.6. Serving MAAR Option

This new option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Update and Proxy Binding Acknowledgement messages exchanged between the CMD and a Previous MAAR. This option is used to notify the P-MAAR about the current Serving MAAR's global address. Its format is as follows:



Type

IANA-4.

Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the length of the option in octets, excluding the type and length fields. This field MUST be set to 16.

Serving MAAR's address

A sixteen-byte field containing the S-MAAR's IPv6 global address.


4.7. DLIF Link-local Address Option

A new DLIF Link-local Address option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Update and Proxy Binding Acknowledgment messages exchanged between MAARs. This option is used for exchanging the



link-local address of the DLIF to be configured on the serving MAAR so it resembles the DLIF configured on the P-MAAR.

The DLIF Link-local Address option has an alignment requirement of 8n+6. Its format is as follows:



Type

IANA-5.

Length

8-bit unsigned integer indicating the length of the option in octets, excluding the type and length fields. This field MUST be set to 16.

DLIF Link-local Address

A sixteen-byte field containing the link-local address of the logical interface.

**4.8. DLIF Link-layer Address Option**

A new DLIF Link-layer Address option is defined for use with the Proxy Binding Update and Proxy Binding Acknowledgment messages exchanged between MAARs. This option is used for exchanging the link-layer address of the DLIF to be configured on the serving MAAR so it resembles the DLIF configured on the P-MAAR.

The format of the DLIF Link-layer Address option is shown below. Based on the size of the address, the option MUST be aligned appropriately, as per mobility option alignment requirements specified in [RFC6275].









Acknowledgment, exchanged between the MAARs are protected using IPsec using the established security association between them. This essentially eliminates the threats related to the impersonation of a MAAR.

When the CMD acts as a PBU/PBA relay, the CMD may act as a relay of a single PBU to multiple previous MAARs. In situations of many fast handovers (e.g., with vehicular networks), there may exist multiple previous (e.g., k) MAARs exist. In this situation, the CMD creates k outgoing packets from a single incoming packet. This bears a certain amplification risk. The CMD SHOULD use a pacing approach to limit this amplification risk.

When the CMD acts as MAAR locator, mobility signaling (PBAs) is exchanged between P-MAARs and current S-MAAR. This requires security associations to exist between the involved MAARs (in addition to the ones needed with the CMD).

Since deregistration is performed by timeout, measures SHOULD be implemented to minimize the risks associated to continued resource consumption (DoS attacks), e.g., imposing a limit of the number of P-MAARs associated to a given MN.

## **7. Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank Dirk von Hugo, John Kaippallimalil, Ines Robles and Joerg Ott for the comments on this document. The authors would also like to thank Marco Liebsch, Dirk von Hugo, Alex Petrescu, Daniel Corujo, Akbar Rahman, Danny Moses, Xinpeng Wei and Satoru Matsushima for their comments and discussion on the documents [[I-D.bernardos-dmm-distributed-anchoring](#)] and [[I-D.bernardos-dmm-pmip](#)] on which the present document is based.

The authors would also like to thank Lyle Bertz and Danny Moses for their in-deep review of this document and their very valuable comments and suggestions.

## **8. References**

### **8.1. Normative References**

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.



- [RFC4191] Draves, R. and D. Thaler, "Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes", [RFC 4191](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4191, November 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4191>>.
- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 4861](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.
- [RFC5213] Gundavelli, S., Ed., Leung, K., Devarapalli, V., Chowdhury, K., and B. Patil, "Proxy Mobile IPv6", [RFC 5213](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5213, August 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5213>>.
- [RFC6275] Perkins, C., Ed., Johnson, D., and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [RFC 6275](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6275, July 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6275>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

## **8.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.bernardos-dmm-distributed-anchoring]  
Bernardos, C. and J. Zuniga, "PMIPv6-based distributed anchoring", [draft-bernardos-dmm-distributed-anchoring-09](#) (work in progress), May 2017.
- [I-D.bernardos-dmm-pmip]  
Bernardos, C., Oliva, A., and F. Giust, "A PMIPv6-based solution for Distributed Mobility Management", [draft-bernardos-dmm-pmip-09](#) (work in progress), September 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-dmm-deployment-models]  
Gundavelli, S. and S. Jeon, "DMM Deployment Models and Architectural Considerations", [draft-ietf-dmm-deployment-models-04](#) (work in progress), May 2018.
- [RFC7333] Chan, H., Ed., Liu, D., Seite, P., Yokota, H., and J. Korhonen, "Requirements for Distributed Mobility Management", [RFC 7333](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7333, August 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7333>>.



- [RFC7429] Liu, D., Ed., Zuniga, JC., Ed., Seite, P., Chan, H., and CJ. Bernardos, "Distributed Mobility Management: Current Practices and Gap Analysis", [RFC 7429](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7429, January 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7429>>.
- [RFC8563] Katz, D., Ward, D., Pallagatti, S., Ed., and G. Mirsky, Ed., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) Multipoint Active Tails", [RFC 8563](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8563, April 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8563>>.

## **Appendix A. Comparison with Requirement document**

In this section we describe how our solution addresses the DMM requirements listed in [[RFC7333](#)].

### **A.1. Distributed mobility management**

"IP mobility, network access solutions, and forwarding solutions provided by DMM MUST enable traffic to avoid traversing a single mobility anchor far from the optimal route."

In our solution, a MAAR is responsible to handle the mobility for those IP flows started when the MN is attached to it. As long as the MN remains connected to the MAAR's access links, the IP packets of such flows can benefit from the optimal path. When the MN moves to another MAAR, the path becomes non-optimal for ongoing flows, as they are anchored to the previous MAAR, but newly started IP sessions are forwarded by the new MAAR through the optimal path.

### **A.2. Bypassable network-layer mobility support for each application session**

"DMM solutions MUST enable network-layer mobility, but it MUST be possible for any individual active application session (flow) to not use it. Mobility support is needed, for example, when a mobile host moves and an application cannot cope with a change in the IP address. Mobility support is also needed when a mobile router changes its IP address as it moves together with a host and, in the presence of ingress filtering, an application in the host is interrupted. However, mobility support at the network layer is not always needed; a mobile node can often be stationary, and mobility support can also be provided at other layers. It is then not always necessary to maintain a stable IP address or prefix for an active application session."

Our DMM solution operates at the IP layer, hence upper layers are totally transparent to the mobility operations. In particular,



ongoing IP sessions are not disrupted after a change of access network. The routability of the old address is ensured by the IP tunnel with the old MAAR. New IP sessions are started with the new address. From the application's perspective, those processes which sockets are bound to a unique IP address do not suffer any impact. For the other applications, the sockets bound to the old address are preserved, whereas next sockets use the new address.

### **A.3. IPv6 deployment**

"DMM solutions SHOULD target IPv6 as the primary deployment environment and SHOULD NOT be tailored specifically to support IPv4, particularly in situations where private IPv4 addresses and/or NATs are used."

The DMM solution we propose targets IPv6 only.

### **A.4. Existing mobility protocols**

"A DMM solution MUST first consider reusing and extending IETF standard protocols before specifying new protocols."

This DMM solution is derived from the operations and messages specified in [[RFC5213](#)].

### **A.5. Coexistence with deployed networks/hosts and operability across different networks**

"A DMM solution may require loose, tight, or no integration into existing mobility protocols and host IP stacks. Regardless of the integration level, DMM implementations MUST be able to coexist with existing network deployments, end hosts, and routers that may or may not implement existing mobility protocols. Furthermore, a DMM solution SHOULD work across different networks, possibly operated as separate administrative domains, when the needed mobility management signaling, forwarding, and network access are allowed by the trust relationship between them"

The partially distributed DMM solution (distributed data plane and centralized control plane) can be extended to provide a fallback mechanism to operate as legacy Proxy Mobile IPv6. It is necessary to instruct MAARs to always establish a tunnel with the same MAAR, working as LMA. The fully distributed DMM solution (distributed data and control plane) can be extended as well, but it requires more intervention. The partially distributed DMM solution can be deployed across different domains with trust agreements if the CMDs of the operators are enabled to transfer context from one node to another.





The fully distributed DMM solution works across multiple domains if the same signalling scheme is used in both domains.

#### **A.6. Operation and management considerations**

"A DMM solution needs to consider configuring a device, monitoring the current operational state of a device, and responding to events that impact the device, possibly by modifying the configuration and storing the data in a format that can be analyzed later.

The proposed solution can re-use existing mechanisms defined for the operation and management of Proxy Mobile IPv6.

#### **A.7. Security considerations**

"A DMM solution MUST support any security protocols and mechanisms needed to secure the network and to make continuous security improvements. In addition, with security taken into consideration early in the design, a DMM solution MUST NOT introduce new security risks or amplify existing security risks that cannot be mitigated by existing security protocols and mechanisms."

The proposed solution does not specify a security mechanism, given that the same mechanism for PMIPv6 can be used.

#### **A.8. Multicast considerations**

"DMM SHOULD enable multicast solutions to be developed to avoid network inefficiency in multicast traffic delivery."

This solution in its current version does not specify any support for multicast traffic.

### **Appendix B. Implementation experience**

The network-based DMM solution described in section [Section 3.4](#) is now available at the Open Distributed Mobility Management (ODMM) project (<http://www.odmm.net/>), under the name of Mobility Anchors Distribution for PMIPv6 (MAD-PMIPv6). The ODMM platform is intended to foster DMM development and deployment, by serving as a framework to host open source implementations.

The MAD-PMIPv6 code is developed in ANSI C from the existing UMIP implementation for PMIP. The most relevant changes with respect to the UMIP original version are related to how to create the CMD and MAAR's state machines from those of an LMA and a MAG; for this purpose, part of the LMA code was copied to the MAG, in order to send PBA messages and parse PBU. Also, the LMA routing functions were



removed completely, and moved to the MAG, because MAARs need to route through the tunnels in downlink (as an LMA) and in uplink (as a MAG).

Tunnel management is hence a relevant technical aspect, as multiple tunnels are established by a single MAAR, which keeps their status directly into the MN's BCE. Indeed, from the implementation experience it was chosen to create an ancillary data structure as field within a BCE: the data structure is called "MAAR list" and stores the previous MAARs' address and the corresponding prefix(es) assigned for the MN. Only the CMD and the serving MAAR store this data structure, because the CMD maintains the global MN's mobility session formed during the MN's roaming within the domain, and the serving MAAR needs to know which previous MAARs were visited, the prefix(es) they assigned and the tunnels established with them. Conversely, a previous MAAR only needs to know which is the current Serving MAAR and establish a single tunnel with it. For this reason, a MAAR that receives a PBU from the CMD (meaning that the MN attached to another MAAR), first sets up the routing state for the MN's prefix(es) it is anchoring, then stops the BCE expiry timer and deletes the MAAR list (if present) since it is no longer useful.

In order to have the MN totally unaware of the changes in the access link, all MAARs implement the Distributed Logical Interface (DLIF) concept. Moreover, it should be noted that the protocols designed in the document work only at the network layer to handle the MNs joining or leaving the domain. This should guarantee a certain independency to a particular access technology. The implementation reflects this reasoning, but we argue that an interaction with lower layers produces a more effective attachment and detachment detection, therefore improving the performance, also regarding de-registration mechanisms.

It was chosen to implement the "proxy" solution because it produces the shortest handover latency, but a slight modification on the CMD state machine can produce the first scenario described ("relay") which guarantees a more consistent request/ack scheme between the MAARs. By modifying also the MAAR's state machine it can be implemented the second solution ("locator").

An early MAD-PMIPv6 implementation was shown during a demo session at the IETF 83rd, in Paris in March 2012. An enhancement version of the prototype has been presented at the 87th IETF meeting in Berlin, July 2013. The updated demo included a use case scenario employing a CDN system for video delivery. More, MAD-PMIPv6 has been extensively used and evaluated within a testbed employing heterogeneous radio accesses within the framework of the MEDIEVAL EU project. MAD-PMIPv6 software is currently part of a DMM test-bed comprising 3 MAARs, one CMD, one MN and a CN. All the machines used in the demos were Linux



UBUNTU 10.04 systems with kernel 2.6.32, but the prototype has been tested also under newer systems. This testbed was also used by the iJOIN EU project.

#### Authors' Addresses

Carlos J. Bernardos  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Av. Universidad, 30  
Leganes, Madrid 28911  
Spain

Phone: +34 91624 6236  
Email: [cjbc@it.uc3m.es](mailto:cjbc@it.uc3m.es)  
URI: <http://www.it.uc3m.es/cjbc/>

Antonio de la Oliva  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Av. Universidad, 30  
Leganes, Madrid 28911  
Spain

Phone: +34 91624 8803  
Email: [aoliva@it.uc3m.es](mailto:aoliva@it.uc3m.es)  
URI: <http://www.it.uc3m.es/aoliva/>

Fabio Giust  
Athonet S.r.l.

Email: [fabio.giust.2011@ieee.org](mailto:fabio.giust.2011@ieee.org)

Juan Carlos Zuniga  
SIGFOX  
425 rue Jean Rostand  
Labege 31670  
France

Email: [j.c.zuniga@ieee.org](mailto:j.c.zuniga@ieee.org)  
URI: <http://www.sigfox.com/>



Alain Mourad  
InterDigital Europe

Email: [Alain.Mourad@InterDigital.com](mailto:Alain.Mourad@InterDigital.com)

URI: <http://www.InterDigital.com/>