

AAA Support for PMIP6 mobility entities authorization and Discovery during localized routing

draft-ietf-dime-pmip6-lr-01

Glen Zorn
Qin Wu
Marco Liebsch
Jouni Korhonen

Status

- Adopted as WG item after IETF 76
- Revised to 01 version WG draft based on some feedback and consensus from IETF 77 meeting.
- Some open issues to be discussed offline among authors.
- Changes to the previous version of WG draft
 - Simplify the figure 2 and 3 for general purpose
 - Add one new use cases described in draft-liebsch-dime-pmip6-Imaresolve-01
 - Other Editorial changes

Issue1#: Structure of Use Case sections

- Problem:
 - Not clear in use case sections what's part of the specification and what's part of background protocol specific
- Suggestion:
 - key aspects of the protocol extension described first (Diameter client sends AAR with Feature vector... etc.), then followed by one or more use cases.

Issue2#: How to differentiate AVPs for MN1 or MN2 using MIP6-Feature-Vector

- Problem:
 - How the Diameter server distinguishes the LMA resolution and LR authorization request from the authorization of the MAG location query.
 - In some cases (e.g., in figure 2,3,4), the Diameter Server need to return MN's LMA address while in some other case(e.g.,the authorization of the MAG location query in figure 5), the Diameter Server needs not return MN's LMA address.
- Suggestion:
 - Define extra new parameters to differentiate these AVPs

Issue 3#:Completeness of the draft

- The level of completeness
 - Jouni raised this question
 - Marco's observation is IANA section is not complete and there is no additional security issues in Security section.
 - Other opinion?
 - Contribution and input are welcome!

Proposals for issue2#

- Proposal 1:
 - LMA1 sends the AAR to the server with the Session ID of MN1. AAA server look up HNP/IP of MN1 using Session ID of MN1 and determine whether or not to return the IP address of MN2's LMA (LMA2).
- Proposal 2:
 - Allocate one more new flag in the MIP-Feature-Vector AVP to indicate to Diameter Server whether or not to return MN's LMA address corresponding to HNP-AVP of MN

Moving Forward

- Encourage more review of draft and early feedback
- Request WG to make decision on choosing either of two proposals?