

DMM WG IETF #83

DMM WG Agenda & Status

THURSDAY, March 29, 2012
Jouni Korhonen & Julien Laganier



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, BOF 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.

Intellectual Property



- When starting a presentation you **MUST** say if:
 - There is IPR associated with your draft
 - The restrictions listed in section 5 of RFC 3978/4748 apply to your draft
- When asking questions or commenting on a draft:
 - You **MUST** disclose any IPR you know of relating to the technology under discussion
- References
 - RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879)
 - “Note well” text



Agenda

- 09:00 Introduction and Administrativa
 - Jabber: Behcet Sarikaya, Note takers: Marco Liebsch, Pierrick Seite, Peter McCann
- 09:10 Architecture Proposals & Comparisons & Discussion
 - Presenters: A. Chan, B. Patil, D. Liu
- 09:40 New Protocols & Protocols
 - Presenters: P. Seite, P. McCann, M. Liebsch
- 10:10 Addressing Enhancements
 - Presenters: D. Liu, S. Gundavelli
- 10:30 PMIPv6 Enhancements and Extensions
 - Presenters: C. Bernandos, D. Liu, W. Luo, J. Korhonen
- 11:10 Distributed Mobile IPv6
 - Presenters: B. Sarikaya
- 11:15 Dimensioning considerations for DMM
 - Presenters: E. Demaria
- 11:20 Wrapping up
 - Discussion about milestones.

Architecture Proposals & Comparisons & Discussion



- [draft-perkins-dmm-matrix](#)
- [draft-chan-dmm-requirements](#)
- [draft-chan-dmm-architecture](#)
- [draft-liu-dmm-dynamic-anchor-discussion](#)
- [draft-patil-dmm-issues-and-approaches2dmm](#)



New Protocols & Protocols

- draft-seite-dmm-dma
- draft-liebsch-mext-dmm-phi
- draft-mccann-dmm-flatarch



Addressing Enhancements

- draft-liu-dmm-address-selection
- draft-liu-dmm-mobility-api
- draft-korhonen-dmm-prefix-properties

PMIPv6 Enhancements and Extensions



- draft-bernardos-dmm-distributed-anchoring
- draft-luo-dmm-pmip-based-dmm-approach
- draft-bernardos-dmm-pmip
- draft-korhonen-dmm-local-prefix

Distributed Mobile IPv6 & Dimensioning considerations for DMM



- draft-sarikaya-dmm-dmipv6
- draft-demaria-dmm-dimensioning-considerations

Discussion about milestones



- Aug 2012 - Submit I-D '**Solution Requirements**' as a working group document. To be Informational RFC.
- Aug 2012 - Submit I-D '**Practices and Gap Analysis**' as a working group document. To be Informational RFC.
- Nov 2012 - Evaluate the need for additional working group document(s) for extensions to fill the identified gaps.
- Jan 2013 - Submit I-D 'Solution Requirements' to the IESG for consideration as an Informational RFC.
- Jan 2013 - Submit I-D 'Practices ' to the IESG for consideration as an Informational RFC.
- Mar 2013 - Submit I-D 'Gap Analysis' to the IESG for consideration as an Informational RFC.
- **Mar 2013 - Evaluate the need for further work** based on the identified gaps and revise the milestones and/or the charter

Question: is this still realistic? There was a flood of solutions I-Ds...