

DMM Interim call #1

- Time: 2nd September, 5PM (Helsinki time, EEST)
-

- Attendee:

Dapeng Liu, Jouni Korhonen, Behcet, Conny Larsson, Dan Romascanu, Danny Moses, Fred Templin, Anthony Chan, Hui Deng, Marco Liebsch, Satoru, Alper

Charter text discussion

- Charter text:
 - https://github.com/jounikor/dmm-re-charter/blob/master/recharter_draft.txt
- Jouni: Any one has issue with first paragraph?
 - None
- Jouni: Any one has issue with second paragraph?
 - Anthony: one suggestion, change 'flat' to 'flating'
 - Jouni: Any one has issue with this changes?
 - None
- Jouni: Any one has issue with third paragraph?
 - Fred: I have post to the list asking text brought back to the charter.
 - Jouni: Do you mean the following text?

"However, mobility management in a limited area, such as within an autonomous system, is not strictly limited to mentioned IP mobility protocols but can be any existing or a new protocol solution enabling the movement of a mobile node such as routing protocols."
 - Fred: Yes.
 - Dapeng: The last sentence, there are two "be", remove one.
 - Conny: Does it allow you to leverage the existing protocol to come up with something new?
 - Jouni: You can extend protocol PMIP/MIP into something else. you can extend other protocols allow to do mobility management. For example, extension of routing protocol. We are also allowed to define something new. Defining new protocol, has to have a good reason.
 - Marco: A clarify question on new protocol. does that need to meet the requirement of backward compatibility?
 - Jouni: For the host does not know about DMM should get at least Internet access.
 - Marco: Backward does not mean to fallback to mobile IP but to simple IP connectivity?
 - Jouni: Yes.
 - Anthony: I have comment on the wording: "new approaches which capitalize on other protocols specified by the IETF".
 - Fred: I have a suggestion. change "however" to "for example"
- Jouni: Any one have issue with 4th paragraph?
 - None
- Jouni: Any one have issue with 5th paragraph?

Wednesday, September 3, 2014

- Marco: first sentence, talk more about "IP end-points" instead of "paths".
- Dan: Not understand of this sentence. What is the difference between previous one?
- Jouni: The signaling and user traffic can be operated. This may or may not mean the signaling and user traffic have different path.
- Dapeng: Missing "of" before "IP end points"?
- Jouni: Prefer not to have "of"
- Danny: Suggest to remove "IP end-points". Marco's suggestion is to allow operation of control and user traffic, why need IP end points here? "path" is better than "IP end-points"
- Jouni: When you have SDN type of solution, you can have different path even you have the same IP address. Marco, are you still willing to defense the proposal you have?
- Marco: As far as people can understand what to do, I am fine with that.
- Jouni: We move to work items discussion. The most confusion one is the first bullet of the first work item. DMM deployment model and architecture. Similar as 3GPP stage 2.
 - Alper: I am unclear. we can talk about current architecture using existing protocols. another thing is that we can talk about is solution. how architecture can evolves. I do not see the first step, seems to documenting current architecture. you need to have solution to describe how architecture evolves. stage 2 example you provided, you know stage 2 documents, they do have solution at high level.
 - Jouni: we can not define deployment model. we can describe logical deployment.
 - Alper: we can have a number of solutions. you'd like to extract those solution to a common document where the solution can refer to the common document in terms of the deployment cases they apply to? is that the intention?
 - Jouni: That was the intention.
 - Alper: That intention is good. the issue is the ordering. we can always abstract and generate a common deployment model. the problem is that from current charter, seems need to first work on deployment model then to work on solution.
 - Marco: we should not exclude different deployment model. different solutions may have different configurations and setup.
 - Jouni : I understand your point and also Alper's concerns. change the order of milestone.
 - Danny: I am OK with changing the order.
- Jouni: Second bullet. A lot of discussion around this.
 - Marco: Apler's question about the difference of first and second bullet. Just clarify that the second bullet is about mobility anchor selection.
- Jouni: The last bullet. exposing mobility state. one example is source address selection.
 - Conny: last bullet, does that imply that it has requirement on the applications? It need to understand the information what we have.
 - Jouni: Yes. It implies the applications, in order to use this information, they need APIs. very quickly, we need to talk about whether we should define API. I do not think we should go that distance.
 - Alper: You say we should not defining API?
 - Jouni: I am not the fan of defining API. Of course, I am just a coordinator of the working group. If the working group really want to define API, it is ok.
 - Alper: to answer Conny's question and shoot more light. IETF has already defined socket extension. RFC 5014, allow the application to do source address selection. allow the application to select a home address and care of address. IETF usual does not do API work, but there were IPv6 source address selection API and also advanced API. That is not the only APIs for the users, we do not define API for the whole industry.
 - Danny: Some of the ideas that we described in our previous meeting, some cases, application require IP continuity, there need to have some way for the application to convey the information. We should not prohibit it.
 - Jouni: I am not saying prohibit it. just saying I am not fan of defining API. you need strong reason why defining API.

- Marco: question to the 3rd bullet. we describe the interface between the forwarding and control function in a generic and abstract way. is this should be proposed standard?
- Jouni: if just like a list of parameters, the mapping of those functions depending on the target protocol.
- Timeline discussion.
 - Fred: what is the rational to move the order of the first?
 - Jouni: you need a solution before you can map that solution to deployment model.
 - Fred: strange that solution comes before scenario and use cases.
 - Jouni: Alper, do you want to defense your view?
 - Alper: Yes. The way I understood the bullet trying to capture how a specific solution be deployed. for a given solution A, how it could be deployed. This is not the problem statement, use case. this is like how a solution could be deployed. this should along with solution description. that is the motivation.
 - Fred: I see the deployment model as the applicability that might be addressed by solutions. there are different scenarios, for example, IPS networks, operator networks, enterprise networks. it is different deployment cases that the solution might apply.
 - Alper: more like applicability. if you just give a protocol, the industry may do not know how to use it. that is the companion document of solution.
 - Marco: the carter allows multiple solutions, we may have 4-5 solutions. we need a single document to describe the deployment of each solution. when we describe deployment model we may find there is a need to define new protocol.
 - Fred: I think you are saying is correct that scenario and deployment mode is examinable piece to see a solution is more applicable than other solutions. I do not know whether enterprise mobility solution has been discussed in the group. enterprise mobility solution spaces is quite large when we talk about mobile devices that might used in enterprise network. I understand this group is more talking about operator and wifi networks but that is only one deployment model and scenario.
 - Alper: we do not mean to exclude enterprise mobility. there is no people bring proposal. what it would be in such document?
 - Fred: enterprise network is just one aspect, the other aspect would be operator networks and wifi network and ISP networks. examining the model and scenario that the solution could apply .
 - Alper: describing how the network working today?
 - Fred: describing mobility problems that solution should be addressing. for example, we have the problem that we do not have distributed mobility management solutions in operator networks today and we will be examining where are the model and scenarios where bring distributed mobility management solutions into working group proposed solutions.
 - Alper: that is my concern that putting it back to gap analysis and problem statement phase.
 - Jouni: from history, very heavily asking by Sri we need this one. when can drop this if we find it is not useful, that is also possible.
 - Alper: not having this document will not lose anything. i do not understand what is going to have in this document today.
 - Fred: one example for enterprise use case, that is quit large use case. I can give an example of my enterprise network where we are trying to play mobile devices that can maintain stable address even the device moves around enterprise topologies. I think it is a very different scenario than what have been discussed in this working group.
 - Alper: i agree we should not ignore enterprise mobility. no one is really brought it up until now. this is the first time that I hear about enterprise network mobility in dmm working group. we can working on that. do we need write it in the charter.
 - Jouni: we are not excluding that. we do not need to explicitly mention it.
 - Jouni: de we go ahead to remove the 'deployment models'? they have been discussed several times and every time it has slightly different flavors.

Wednesday, September 3, 2014

- Fred: I do not see why it can not be included. I am willing to work on such document.
- Alper: if that is not the first item we can keep it. we can not let it blocking the progress of the working group. the worst case is that people are waiting on this document and we still do not exactly know what it does.
- Jouni: there is no dependency.
- Alper: the timeline seems suggest this document should coming first.
- Fred: I understand your concern now. to address the concern, perhaps that item simply to say this item will not delay other deliverables.
- Alper: if we want to keep it I do not have objection but we need to know what will be included in this document. is it problem statement, gap analysis? it is unclear to me.
- Jouni: this is my proposal now. remove the milestones for this.
- Fred: I would suggest to keep it.
- Dan: this is one more possible solution. the document can be left as a working document. it could be individual draft not working group document.
- Alper: to address Fred's concern can be addressed by other ways: to adding enterprise network mobility in the charter.
- Jouni: we are not scoping enterprise network out. if we do not scope something out, they are in. I suggest that we left the bullet as a work item and we do not have explicit milestone for it. we can add this milestone when we actually see that there is something meaningful forming for that document.
- Marco: that is a good solution. discussion on enterprise network scenario should not be the main purpose of this document. but I think we need at least a document to describe what we can do with the protocol that we specified.
- Jouni: we can continue discussion in the mailing list.