

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: October 20, 2014

H. Chan (Ed.)  
Huawei Technologies  
D. Liu  
China Mobile  
P. Seite  
Orange  
H. Yokota  
KDDI Lab  
J. Korhonen  
Broadcom Communications  
April 18, 2014

## **Requirements for Distributed Mobility Management draft-ietf-dmm-requirements-16**

### Abstract

This document defines the requirements for Distributed Mobility Management (DMM) at the network layer. The hierarchical structure in traditional wireless networks has led primarily to centrally deployed mobility anchors. As some wireless networks are evolving away from the hierarchical structure, it can be useful to have a distributed model for mobility management in which traffic does not need to traverse centrally deployed mobility anchors far from the optimal route. The motivation and the problems addressed by each requirement are also described.

### Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

### 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 <http://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 October 20, 2014.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 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 (<http://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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Conventions used in this document . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Centralized versus distributed mobility management . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Centralized mobility management . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Distributed mobility management . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Problem Statement . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Contributors . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>



## **1. Introduction**

In the past decade a fair number of network-layer mobility protocols have been standardized [[RFC6275](#)] [[RFC5944](#)] [[RFC5380](#)] [[RFC6301](#)] [[RFC5213](#)]. Although these protocols differ in terms of functions and associated message formats, they all employ a mobility anchor to allow a mobile node to remain reachable after it has moved to a different network. The anchor point, among other tasks, ensures connectivity by forwarding packets destined to, or sent from, the mobile node. It is a centrally deployed mobility anchor in the sense that the deployed architectures today have a small number of these anchors and the traffic of millions of mobile nodes in an operator network are typically managed by the same anchor. Such a mobility anchor may still have to reside in the subscriber's provider network even when the subscriber is roaming to a visited network, in order that certain functions such as charging and billing can be performed more readily by the provider's network. An example provider network is a Third Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) network.

Distributed mobility management (DMM) is an alternative to the above centralized deployment. The background behind the interests to study DMM are primarily in the following.

- (1) Mobile users are, more than ever, consuming Internet content including that of local Content Delivery Networks (CDNs). Such traffic imposes new requirements on mobile core networks for data traffic delivery. To prevent exceeding the available core network capacity, service providers need to implement new strategies such as selective IPv4 traffic offload (e.g., [[RFC6909](#)], 3GPP work items Local IP Access (LIPA) and Selected IP Traffic Offload (SIPTO) [[TS.23.401](#)]) through alternative access networks such as Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) [[Paper-Mobile.Data.Offloading](#)]. In addition, a gateway selection mechanism takes the user proximity into account within the Evolved Packet Core (EPC) [[TS.29303](#)]. Yet these mechanisms were not pursued in the past owing to charging and billing considerations which require solutions beyond the mobility protocol. Consequently, assigning a gateway anchor node from a visited network when roaming to the visited network has only recently been done and is limited to voice services.

Both traffic offloading and CDN mechanisms could benefit from the development of mobile architectures with fewer hierarchical levels introduced into the data path by the mobility management system. This trend of "flattening" the mobile networks works best for direct communications among peers in the same geographical area. Distributed mobility management in the flattening mobile networks would anchor the traffic closer to



the point of attachment of the user.

- (2) Today's mobile networks present service providers with new challenges. Mobility patterns indicate that mobile nodes often remain attached to the same point of attachment for considerable periods of time [[Paper-Locating.User](#)]. Specific IP mobility management support is not required for applications that launch and complete their sessions while the mobile node is connected to the same point of attachment. However, currently, IP mobility support is designed for always-on operation, maintaining all parameters of the context for each mobile subscriber for as long as they are connected to the network. This can result in a waste of resources and unnecessary costs for the service provider. Infrequent node mobility coupled with application intelligence suggest that mobility support could be provided selectively such as in [I-D.bhandari-dhc-class-based-prefix] and [[I-D.korhonen-6man-prefix-properties](#)], thus reducing the amount of context maintained in the network.

DMM may distribute the mobility anchors in the data-plane in flattening the mobility network such that the mobility anchors are positioned closer to the user; ideally, mobility agents could be collocated with the first-hop router. Facilitated by the distribution of mobility anchors, it may be possible to selectively use or not use mobility protocol support depending on whether such support is needed or not. It can thus reduce the amount of state information that must be maintained in various mobility agents of the mobile network. It can then avoid the unnecessary establishment of mechanisms to forward traffic from an old to a new mobility anchor.

This document compares distributed mobility management with centralized mobility management in [Section 3](#). The problems that can be addressed with DMM are summarized in [Section 4](#). The mandatory requirements as well as the optional requirements for network-layer distributed mobility management are given in [Section 5](#). Finally, security considerations are discussed in [Section 6](#).

The problem statement and the use cases [[I-D.yokota-dmm-scenario](#)] can be found in [[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.Review](#)].

## **[2. Conventions used in this document](#)**

### **[2.1. Terminology](#)**

All the general mobility-related terms and their acronyms used in this document are to be interpreted as defined in the Mobile IPv6 base specification [[RFC6275](#)], in the Proxy mobile IPv6 specification





[[RFC5213](#)], and in Mobility Related Terminology [[RFC3753](#)]. These terms include the following: mobile node (MN), correspondent node (CN), and home agent (HA) as per [[RFC6275](#)]; local mobility anchor (LMA) and mobile access gateway (MAG) as per [[RFC5213](#)], and context as per [[RFC3753](#)].

In addition, this draft introduces the following terms.

#### Centrally deployed mobility anchors

refer to the mobility management deployments in which there are very few mobility anchors and the traffic of millions of mobile nodes in an operator network are managed by the same anchor.

#### Centralized mobility management

makes use of centrally deployed mobility anchors.

#### Distributed mobility management

is not centralized so that traffic does not need to traverse centrally deployed mobility anchors far from the optimal route.

#### Hierarchical mobile network

has a hierarchy of network elements arranged into multiple hierarchical levels which are introduced into the data path by the mobility management system.

#### Flattening mobile network

refers to the hierarchical mobile network which is going through the trend of reducing its number of hierarchical levels.

#### Flatter mobile network

has fewer hierarchical levels compared to a hierarchical mobile network.

#### Mobility context

is the collection of information required to provide mobility management support for a given mobile node.



### **3. Centralized versus distributed mobility management**

Mobility management is needed because the IP address of a mobile node may change as the node moves. Mobility management functions may be implemented at different layers of the protocol stack. At the IP (network) layer, mobility management can be client-based or network-based.

An IP-layer mobility management protocol is typically based on the principle of distinguishing between a session identifier and a forwarding address and maintaining a mapping between the two. In Mobile IP, the new IP address of the mobile node after the node has moved is the forwarding address, whereas the original IP address before the mobile node moves serves as the session identifier. The location management (LM) information is kept by associating the forwarding address with the session identifier. Packets addressed to the session identifier will first route to the original network which re-directs them using the forwarding address to deliver to the session. Re-directing packets this way can result in long routes. An existing optimization routes directly using the forwarding address of the host, and such is a host-based solution.

The next two subsections explain centralized and distributed mobility management functions in the network.

#### **3.1. Centralized mobility management**

In centralized mobility management, the location information in terms of a mapping between the session identifier and the forwarding address is kept at a single mobility anchor, and packets destined to the session identifier are forwarded via this anchor. In other words, such mobility management systems are centralized in both the control plane and the data plane (mobile node IP traffic).

Many existing mobility management deployments make use of centralized mobility anchoring in a hierarchical network architecture, as shown in Figure 1. Examples are the home agent (HA) and local mobility anchor (LMA) serving as the anchors for the mobile node (MN) and Mobile Access Gateway (MAG) in Mobile IPv6 [[RFC6275](#)] and in Proxy Mobile IPv6 [[RFC5213](#)] respectively. Cellular networks such as the 3GPP General Packet Radio System (GPRS) networks and 3GPP Evolved Packet System (EPS) networks employ centralized mobility management too. In the 3GPP GPRS network, the Gateway GPRS Support Node (GGSN), Serving GPRS Support Node (SGSN) and Radio Network Controller (RNC) constitute a hierarchy of anchors. In the 3GPP EPS network, the Packet Data Network Gateway (P-GW) and Serving Gateway (S-GW) constitute another hierarchy of anchors.






Figure 1. Centralized mobility management.

### 3.2. Distributed mobility management

Mobility management functions may also be distributed in the data plane to multiple networks as shown in Figure 2, so that a mobile node in any of these networks may be served by a nearby function with appropriate forwarding management (FM) capability.




Figure 2. Distributed mobility management.

DMM is distributed in the data plane, whereas the control plane may either be centralized or distributed [[I-D.yokota-dmm-scenario](#)]. The former case implicitly assumes separation of data and control planes as described in [[I-D.wakikawa-netext-pmip-cp-up-separation](#)]. While mobility management can be distributed, it is not necessary for other functions such as subscription management, subscription database, and network access authentication to be similarly distributed.



A distributed mobility management scheme for a flattening mobile network consisting of access nodes is proposed in [Paper-Distributed.Dynamic.Mobility]. Its benefits over centralized mobility management have been shown through simulations [Paper-Distributed.Centralized.Mobility]. Moreover, the (re)use and extension of existing protocols in the design of both fully distributed mobility management [[Paper-Migrating.Home.Agents](#)] [Paper-Distributed.Mobility.SAE] and partially distributed mobility management [[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.PMIP](#)] [Paper-Distributed.Mobility.MIP] have been reported in the literature. Therefore, before designing new mobility management protocols for a future distributed architecture, it is recommended to first consider whether existing mobility management protocols can be extended.

#### **4. Problem Statement**

The problems that can be addressed with DMM are summarized in the following:

**PS1: Non-optimal routes**

Forwarding via a centralized anchor often results in non-optimal routes, thereby increasing the end-to-end delay. The problem is manifested, for example, when accessing a nearby server or servers of a Content Delivery Network (CDN), or when receiving locally available IP multicast or sending IP multicast packets. (Existing route optimization is only a host-based solution. On the other hand, localized routing with PMIPv6 [[RFC6705](#)] addresses only a part of the problem where both the MN and the correspondent node (CN) are attached to the same MAG, and it is not applicable when the CN does not behave like an MN.)

**PS2: Divergence from other evolutionary trends in network architectures such as distribution of content delivery.**

Mobile networks have generally been evolving towards a flatter and flatter network. Centralized mobility management, which is non-optimal with a flatter network architecture, does not support this evolution.

**PS3: Lack of scalability of centralized tunnel management and mobility context maintenance**

Setting up tunnels through a central anchor and maintaining mobility context for each MN usually requires more concentrated resources in a centralized design, thus reducing scalability.





Distributing the tunnel maintenance function and the mobility context maintenance function among different network entities with proper signaling protocol design can avoid increasing the concentrated resources with an increasing number of MNs.

PS4: Single point of failure and attack

Centralized anchoring designs may be more vulnerable to single points of failures and attacks than a distributed system. The impact of a successful attack on a system with centralized mobility management can be far greater as well.

PS5: Unnecessary mobility support to clients that do not need it

IP mobility support is usually provided to all MNs. Yet it is not always required, and not every parameter of mobility context is always used. For example, some applications or nodes do not need a stable IP address during a handover to maintain session continuity. Sometimes, the entire application session runs while the MN does not change the point of attachment. Besides, some sessions, e.g., SIP-based sessions, can handle mobility at the application layer and hence do not need IP mobility support; it is then unnecessary to provide IP mobility support for such sessions.

PS6: Mobility signaling overhead with peer-to-peer communication

Wasting resources when mobility signaling (e.g., maintenance of the tunnel, keep alive signaling, etc.) is not turned off for peer-to-peer communication.

PS7: Deployment with multiple mobility solutions

There are already many variants and extensions of MIP as well mobility solutions at other layers. Deployment of new mobility management solutions can be challenging, and debugging difficult, when they co-exist with solutions already deployed in the field.

PS8: Duplicate multicast traffic

IP multicast distribution over architectures using IP mobility solutions (e.g., [RFC6224](#)) may lead to convergence of duplicated multicast subscriptions towards the downstream tunnel entity (e.g., MAG in PMIPv6). Concretely, when multicast subscription for individual mobile nodes is coupled with mobility tunnels (e.g., PMIPv6 tunnel), duplicate multicast subscription(s) is prone to be received through



different upstream paths. This problem may also exist or be more severe in a distributed mobility environment.

## 5. Requirements

After comparing distributed mobility management against centralized deployment in [Section 3](#) and describing the problems in [Section 4](#), this section identifies the following requirements:

### REQ1: Distributed mobility management

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

This requirement on distribution is in the data plane only. It does not impose constraints on whether the control plane should be distributed or centralized. However, if the control plane is centralized while the data plane is distributed, it is implicit that the control plane and data plane need to separate ([Section 3.2](#)).

Motivation: This requirement is motivated by current trends in network evolution: (a) it is cost- and resource-effective to cache contents, and the caching (e.g., CDN) servers are distributed so that each user in any location can be close to one of the servers; (b) the significantly larger number of mobile nodes and flows call for improved scalability; (c) single points of failure are avoided in a distributed system; (d) threats against centrally deployed anchors, e.g., home agent and local mobility anchor, are mitigated in a distributed system.

This requirement addresses the problems PS1, PS2, PS3, and PS4 described in [Section 4](#).

### REQ2: 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.

Different active sessions can also differ in whether network-layer mobility support is needed. IP mobility, network access and forwarding solutions provided by DMM MUST then enable the possibility of independent handling for each application session of a user or mobile device.

The handling of mobility management to the granularity of an individual session of a user/device SHOULD need proper session identification in addition to user/device identification.

Motivation: The motivation of this requirement is to enable more efficient forwarding and more efficient use of network resources by selecting an IP address or prefix according to whether mobility support is needed and by not maintaining context at the mobility anchor when there is no such need.

This requirement addresses the problems PS5 and PS6 described in [Section 4](#).

#### REQ3: IPv6 deployment

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

Motivation: This requirement conforms to the general orientation of IETF work. DMM deployment is foreseen in mid- to long-term horizon, when IPv6 is expected to be far more common than today.

This requirement avoids the unnecessarily complexity in solving the problems in [Section 4](#) for IPv4, which will not be able to use some of the IPv6-specific features.

#### REQ4: Existing mobility protocols

A DMM solution MUST first consider reusing and extending IETF-standardized protocols before specifying new protocols.

Motivation: Reuse of existing IETF work is more efficient and less error-prone.



This requirement attempts to avoid the need of new protocols development and therefore their potential problems of being time-consuming and error-prone.

REQ5: 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 stack. Regardless of the integration level, such a DMM solution **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.

Motivation: (a) to preserve backwards compatibility so that existing networks and hosts are not affected and continue to function as usual, and (b) enable inter-domain operation if desired.

This requirement addresses the problem PS7 described in [Section 4](#).

REQ6: 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.

Motivation: Various attacks such as impersonation, denial of service, man-in-the-middle attacks, and so on, may be launched in a DMM deployment. For instance, an illegitimate node may attempt to access a network providing DMM. Another example is that a malicious node can forge a number of signaling messages thus redirecting traffic from its legitimate path.

Consequently, the specific node or nodes to which the traffic is redirected may be under a denial of service attack, whereas other nodes do not receive their traffic. Accordingly, security mechanisms/protocols providing access control, integrity, authentication, authorization, confidentiality, etc. should be used to protect the DMM entities as they are





already used to protect against existing networks and existing mobility protocols defined in IETF. Yet if a candidate DMM solution is such that even the proper use of these existing security mechanisms/protocols are unable to provide sufficient security protection, that candidate DMM solution is causing uncontrollable security problems.

This requirement prevents a DMM solution from introducing uncontrollable problems of potentially insecure mobility management protocols which make deployment infeasible because platforms conforming to the protocols are at risk for data loss and numerous other dangers, including financial harm to the users.

REQ7: Multicast considerations

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

Motivation: Existing multicast deployment have been introduced after completing the design of the reference mobility protocol, often leading to network inefficiency and non-optimal forwarding for the multicast traffic. Instead DMM should consider multicast early so that the multicast solutions can better consider efficiency nature in the multicast traffic delivery (such as duplicate multicast subscriptions towards the downstream tunnel entities). The multicast solutions should then avoid restricting the management of all IP multicast traffic to a single host through a dedicated (tunnel) interface on multicast-capable access routers.

This requirement addresses the problems PS1 and PS8 described in [Section 4](#).

REQ8: OAM considerations

DMM SHOULD support operations, administration and management (OAM) solutions to reduce OAM complexity and operational expenditure.

Motivation: A DMM solution that takes OAM into considerations from the beginning of its design can avoid difficulty or incompatibility to implement efficient OAM solutions.

This requirement avoids DMM designs that make OAM difficult or costly.



## **6. Security Considerations**

Please refer to the discussion under Security requirement in [Section 5](#).

## **7. IANA Considerations**

None

## **8. Contributors**

This requirements document is a joint effort among numerous participants working in a team. Valuable comments and suggestions in various reviews from the following area directors and IESG members have also contributed to much improvements: Russ Housley, Catherine Meadows, Adrian Farrel, Barry Leiba, Alissa Cooper, Ted Lemon, Brian Haberman, Stephen Farrell, Joel Jaeggli, Alia Atlas, and Benoit Claise. In addition to the authors, each of the following has made very significant and important contributions to the working group draft in this work:

Charles E. Perkins  
Huawei Technologies  
Email: charliep@computer.org

Melia Telemaco  
Alcatel-Lucent Bell Labs  
Email: telemaco.melia@gmail.com

Elena Demaria  
Telecom Italia  
via G. Reiss Romoli, 274, TORINO, 10148, Italy  
Email: elena.demaria@telecomitalia.it

Jong-Hyouk Lee  
Sangmyung University, Korea  
Email: jonghyouk@smu.ac.kr

Kostas Pentikousis  
EICT GmbH  
Email: k.pentikousis@eict.de

Tricci So  
ZTE  
Email: tso@zteusa.com



Carlos J. Bernardos  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Av. Universidad, 30, Leganes, Madrid 28911, Spain  
Email: cjbc@it.uc3m.es

Peter McCann  
Huawei Technologies  
Email: Peter.McCann@huawei.com

Seok Joo Koh  
Kyungpook National University, Korea  
Email: sjkoh@knu.ac.kr

Wen Luo  
ZTE  
No.68, Zijinhua RD, Yuhuatai District, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012, China  
Email: luo.wen@zte.com.cn

Sri Gundavelli  
Cisco  
sgundave@cisco.com

Hui Deng  
China Mobile  
Email: denghui@chinamobile.com

Marco Liebsch  
NEC Laboratories Europe  
Email: liebsch@neclab.eu

Carl Williams  
MCSR Labs  
Email: carlw@mcsr-labs.org

Seil Jeon  
Instituto de Telecomunicacoes, Aveiro  
Email: seiljeon@av.it.pt

Sergio Figueiredo  
Universidade de Aveiro  
Email: sfigueiredo@av.it.pt

Stig Venaas  
Email: stig@venaas.com

Luis Miguel Contreras Murillo  
Telefonica I+D  
Email: lmcm@tid.es



Juan Carlos Zuniga  
InterDigital  
Email: JuanCarlos.Zuniga@InterDigital.com

Alexandru Petrescu  
Email: alexandru.petrescu@gmail.com

Georgios Karagiannis  
University of Twente  
Email: g.karagiannis@utwente.nl

Julien Laganier  
Juniper  
Email: julien.ietf@gmail.com

Wassim Michel Haddad  
Ericsson  
Email: Wassim.Haddad@ericsson.com

Dirk von Hugo  
Deutsche Telekom Laboratories  
Email: Dirk.von-Hugo@telekom.de

Ahmad Muhanna  
Award Solutions  
Email: asmuhanna@yahoo.com

Byoung-Jo Kim  
ATT Labs  
Email: macsbug@research.att.com

Hassan Ali-Ahmad  
Orange  
Email: hassan.aliahmad@orange.com

Alper Yegin  
Samsung  
Email: alper.yegin@partner.samsung.com

## **9. References**

### **9.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3753] Manner, J. and M. Kojo, "Mobility Related Terminology",





[RFC 3753](#), June 2004.

[RFC5213] Gundavelli, S., Leung, K., Devarapalli, V., Chowdhury, K., and B. Patil, "Proxy Mobile IPv6", [RFC 5213](#), August 2008.

[RFC6275] Perkins, C., Johnson, D., and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [RFC 6275](#), July 2011.

## 9.2. Informative References

[I-D.bhandari-dhc-class-based-prefix]

Bhandari, S., Halwasia, G., Gundavelli, S., Deng, H., Thiebaut, L., Korhonen, J., and I. Farrer, "DHCPv6 class based prefix", [draft-bhandari-dhc-class-based-prefix-05](#) (work in progress), July 2013.

[I-D.korhonen-6man-prefix-properties]

Korhonen, J., Patil, B., Gundavelli, S., Seite, P., and D. Liu, "IPv6 Prefix Properties", [draft-korhonen-6man-prefix-properties-02](#) (work in progress), July 2013.

[I-D.wakikawa-netext-pmip-cp-up-separation]

Wakikawa, R., Pazhyannur, R., and S. Gundavelli, "Separation of Control and User Plane for Proxy Mobile IPv6", [draft-wakikawa-netext-pmip-cp-up-separation-00](#) (work in progress), February 2014.

[I-D.yokota-dmm-scenario]

Yokota, H., Seite, P., Demaria, E., and Z. Cao, "Use case scenarios for Distributed Mobility Management", [draft-yokota-dmm-scenario-00](#) (work in progress), October 2010.

[Paper-Distributed.Centralized.Mobility]

Bertin, P., Bonjour, S., and J-M. Bonnin, "A Distributed or Centralized Mobility", Proceedings of Global Communications Conference (GlobeCom), December 2009.

[Paper-Distributed.Dynamic.Mobility]

Bertin, P., Bonjour, S., and J-M. Bonnin, "A Distributed Dynamic Mobility Management Scheme Designed for Flat IP Architectures", Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on New Technologies, Mobility and Security (NTMS), 2008.

[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.MIP]

Chan, H., "Distributed Mobility Management with Mobile



IP", Proceedings of IEEE International Communication Conference (ICC) Workshop on Telecommunications: from Research to Standards, June 2012.

[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.PMIP]

Chan, H., "Proxy Mobile IP with Distributed Mobility Anchors", Proceedings of GlobeCom Workshop on Seamless Wireless Mobility, December 2010.

[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.Review]

Chan, H., Yokota, H., Xie, J., Seite, P., and D. Liu, "Distributed and Dynamic Mobility Management in Mobile Internet: Current Approaches and Issues", Journal of Communications, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 4-15, February 2011.

[Paper-Distributed.Mobility.SAE]

Fisher, M., Anderson, F., Kopsel, A., Schafer, G., and M. Schlager, "A Distributed IP Mobility Approach for 3G SAE", Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC), 2008.

[Paper-Locating.User]

Kirby, G., "Locating the User", Communication International, 1995.

[Paper-Migrating.Home.Agents]

Wakikawa, R., Valadon, G., and J. Murai, "Migrating Home Agents Towards Internet-scale Mobility Deployments", Proceedings of the ACM 2nd CoNEXT Conference on Future Networking Technologies, December 2006.

[Paper-Mobile.Data.Offloading]

Lee, K., Lee, J., Yi, Y., Rhee, I., and S. Chong, "Mobile Data Offloading: How Much Can WiFi Deliver?", SIGCOMM 2010, 2010.

[RFC5380] Soliman, H., Castelluccia, C., ElMalki, K., and L. Bellier, "Hierarchical Mobile IPv6 (HMIPv6) Mobility Management", [RFC 5380](#), October 2008.

[RFC5944] Perkins, C., "IP Mobility Support for IPv4, Revised", [RFC 5944](#), November 2010.

[RFC6224] Schmidt, T., Waehlich, M., and S. Krishnan, "Base Deployment for Multicast Listener Support in Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Domains", [RFC 6224](#), April 2011.



- [RFC6301] Zhu, Z., Wakikawa, R., and L. Zhang, "A Survey of Mobility Support in the Internet", [RFC 6301](#), July 2011.
- [RFC6705] Krishnan, S., Koodli, R., Loureiro, P., Wu, Q., and A. Dutta, "Localized Routing for Proxy Mobile IPv6", [RFC 6705](#), September 2012.
- [RFC6909] Gundavelli, S., Zhou, X., Korhonen, J., Feige, G., and R. Koodli, "IPv4 Traffic Offload Selector Option for Proxy Mobile IPv6", [RFC 6909](#), April 2013.
- [TS.23.401] 3GPP, "General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) enhancements for Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN) access", 3GPP TR 23.401 10.10.0, March 2013.
- [TS.29303] 3GPP, "Domain Name System Procedures; Stage 3", 3GPP TR 23.303 11.2.0, September 2012.

#### Authors' Addresses

H Anthony Chan (editor)  
Huawei Technologies  
5340 Legacy Dr. Building 3, Plano, TX 75024, USA  
Email: [h.a.chan@ieee.org](mailto:h.a.chan@ieee.org)

Dapeng Liu  
China Mobile  
Unit2, 28 Xuanwumenxi Ave, Xuanwu District, Beijing 100053, China  
Email: [liudapeng@chinamobile.com](mailto:liudapeng@chinamobile.com)

Pierrick Seite  
Orange  
4, rue du Clos Courtel, BP 91226, Cesson-Sevigne 35512, France  
Email: [pierrick.seite@orange.com](mailto:pierrick.seite@orange.com)

Hidetoshi Yokota  
KDDI Lab  
2-1-15 Ohara, Fujimino, Saitama, 356-8502 Japan  
Email: [yokota@kddilabs.jp](mailto:yokota@kddilabs.jp)



Jouni Korhonen  
Broadcom Communications  
Porkkalankatu 24, FIN-00180 Helsinki, Finland  
Email: jouni.nospam@gmail.com