

Source: TSG CN Chairman
Title: Report of Meetings between the CN Chair and IETF Area Directors
Document for: Information
Agenda Item: 8.1.1

Report of Meetings between the CN Chair and IETF Area Directors

1 Transport Area

An informal meeting was held on January 5th with Allison Mankin and Scott Bradner (IETF Transport Area ADs). Such interactions are encouraged as part of the IETF/3GPP Collaboration Agreement. This discussion was productive. The following are some of the main points from the meeting.

1.1 Interaction between IETF and 3GPP.

- Informal communication is encouraged. In particular the 3GPP WG chairs should contact the relevant IETF WG chairs and establish an informal communication that can be used to alleviate problems before they occur. (ADs, TSG chairs, and IETF coordinators should be kept informed of the discussions).
- The IETF WG chairs and ADs should be alerted as soon as possible of any 3GPP required extensions. They will endeavor to be accommodating, but there is little they can do if there is insufficient time.
- Solutions should as much as possible be worked in the IETF. In particular, the 3GPP should avoid developing a complete solution and then dropping it in the IETF's lap.
- The approach of bringing 3GPP proposals in via individuals is the correct one. The marking of proposals as "3GPP endorsed" is useful for the chairs, but probably will have little influence on the e-mail discussions.
- The ADs serve as a first level appeals process if there is a feeling that the 3GPP requirements are not being adequately considered.

1.2 Project Planning Discussions

- N1-001434 was used as a basis for discussion of the timeline requirements for 3GPP (based on the Rel 5 schedule). This Tdoc lists several IETF work items that may be required by the IM subsystem (not the "may" since it is not 100% sure they will all be required). Most of the WIs identified in this paper are on track and should be completed in time. The only critical one which may be problematic is "Integration of resource management and SIP". It was acknowledged that new requirements will almost certainly be discovered.
- If a long term option is to migrate from GTP to mobile IP, then 3GPP should follow the work starting up on micro-mobility. Now is the right time to input any requirements the 3GPP has.
- Chairs active in end-to-end QoS should speak to the relevant IETF WGs to discuss needs before work progresses too far. It is realized that the QoS work needs to be enhanced and 3GPP input would be useful.
- There is a question on whether low priority bits in AMR need to be protected within RTP to the extent that errors in those bits are at least detected. A separate e-mail has been sent out on this issue.
- If AAA protocols such as DIAMETER are to be used, then there should be early discussions with the IETF WG chairs to ensure that the protocol is not misused.

2 Internet Area

Informal meetings were held with the IETF Internet Area Directors (Thomas Narten on February 14, 2001 and Erik Nordmark on February, 23, 2001). Here are some of the highlights of the discussions:

2.1 Ipv6 Issues

The biggest danger with the introduction of IPv6 within 3GPP is that not all ramifications may have been worked out. The IETF would welcome the opportunity to review the 3GPP architectural plans for use of IPv6 to ensure that there are no unforeseen problems (Note, there will be no formal IETF review of 3GPP documents, only individual opinions). The following steps are proposed:

- A 3GPP mailing list be set up on 3GPP IPv6 issues. This will be the focus of 3GPP IPv6 discussions. The IETF IPv6 experts will be invited to join the list.
- The IETF IPNG working group will have an interim meeting in May. It is proposed that a day be added at the end to deal with 3GPP issues. Relevant 3GPP experts should attend. The schedule of this day needs to be coordinated with the 3GPP schedule.

2.2 Technical Issues

- DHCPv6: This is still held up. If the 3GPP advertises that it is needed by a specific date, then it could be finished by summer.
- Mobile IP: There are security concerns over how to prevent masquerade binding updates. This needs to be stable for incorporation in the terminals.
- What progress is occurring within the 3GPP on key distribution algorithms. Will IKE be selected?
- Are there any privacy concerns on the use of IPv6 autoconfiguration to assign UE addresses? If stateless autoconfiguration is not being used for UE address assignment, has it been considered?
- Will UE addresses be externally available via DNS? If so, this could substantially increase the number of DNS entries needed for IPv6.
- Does the 3GPP have any interest in a Basic User Registration Protocol (to be discussed in an IETF BOF session in Minneapolis).

2.3 IETF Dependency List

There should be a list of IETF dependencies maintained in the 3GPP. This could be a dynamic document, but it would allow both groups to keep track of what RFCs were on the critical path for 3GPP releases.

3 O&M Area

Based upon the decision by CN to use Diameter protocol as the working assumption the Cx interface. Meetings will be set up with the O&M Area directors (AAA falls under the O&M area). This should be coordinated with SA since charging and security fall under SA.

4 Recommendations

The following are recommendations on how to progress work in these areas towards the IETF

- a. The 3GPP workplan should be upgraded to include the known IETF dependencies
- b. A mailing list for IPv6 usage and migration should be set up in the 3GPP (probably a SA or SA2 list)
- c. An ad-hoc should be set up before the May IETF IPNG meeting to organize the 3GPP presentations towards IETF
- d. The SA2 QoS Ad-Hoc should document and QoS deficiencies and report these to the IETF for possible inclusion in future evolutions of the QoS protocols.
- e. 3GPP Individual members are encouraged to be active within the IETF mailing lists to participate in the various studies and answering the various questions posed by the IETF.