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➢ Discuss comments received
• Broken – Traffic from remote peer communicating with client over ISP-B is broken because Router2 with FW2 has no mappings.
Solution - A

PCP client talks to both PCP servers.
Solution - B

PCP client only talks to one PCP server; which syncs to other PCP server.
Benefits of Solution - A

• Works for NAT devices which assign addresses of distinct address families. Example NAT64, NPTv6.

• For PCP Flow extensions, responses could be different from Router 1 and 2.
  – Application has flexibility to pick appropriate ISP based on PCP responses.
Benefits of Solution - A

- Multiple physical interfaces = Multiple virtual interfaces.
  - Cellular + Wifi = 2 wired ISP.
- PCP client needs the capability to talk to multiple servers.
  - ICE Agent uses PCP to learn and prioritize candidates from multiple interfaces.
- MPTCP stack needs PCP client to communicate with multiple PCP servers to reduce keepalives, pick interface for primary sub-flow etc.
Ordering of PCP Server addresses

- If PCP client wants IPv4 mapping then sort IPv4 server IP's from as per RFC 6724 and then try them one by one until one responds. **Reason:** THIRD_PARTY option should be used which is not optimal.
Name verses IP addresses

• Draft will be updated to use IP addresses instead of names. PCP DHCP draft uses IP addresses.
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