



# Distributed Mobility Anchoring

draft-ietf-dmm-distributed-mobility-anchoring-11

H. Chan (Ed.), X. Xei, J. Lee, S. Jeon and CJ. Bernardos (Ed.)

Bangkok, DMM WG, 2018-11-09

# Outline

- Status
- Overview
- Next Steps

# History & Status

- First significant update for London
  - -07 had 46 pages, -08 had 15, -11 has 17 pages
  - Aimed at reducing complexity
  - Terminology and drawings simplified
- 1 revision since Montreal
  - Addressing Lyle's detailed review
- The draft is available on github
  - <https://github.com/cjbc/draft-ietf-dmm-distributed-mobility-anchoring>

# Overview (-11, current)

1.	Introduction . . . . .	2
2.	Conventions and Terminology . . . . .	4
3.	Distributed Mobility Anchoring . . . . .	5
3.1.	Configurations for Different Networks . . . . .	5
3.1.1.	Network-based DMM . . . . .	5
3.1.2.	Client-based DMM . . . . .	6
4.	IP Mobility Handling in Distributed Anchoring Environments - Mobility Support Only When Needed . . . . .	7
4.1.	Nomadic case (no need of IP mobility): Changing to new IP prefix/address . . . . .	8
4.2.	Mobility case, traffic redirection . . . . .	10
4.3.	Mobility case, anchor relocation . . . . .	12
5.	Security Considerations . . . . .	13
6.	IANA Considerations . . . . .	14
7.	Contributors . . . . .	14
8.	References . . . . .	14
8.1.	Normative References . . . . .	14
8.2.	Informative References . . . . .	16
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	16

# Overview

- Three cases considered:
  - Nomadic case: no address continuity is required. The IP address used by the MN changes after movement.
  - Mobility case, traffic redirection: address continuity is required. Previous anchor still anchors traffic using the old IP address.
  - Mobility case, anchor relocation: address continuity is required. Anchor is changed.

# Next steps

- The document is stable and has gone through several detailed reviews (including Marco's and Lyle's)
- Authors believe document is ready for WGLC