



Mobility Management in the Next Generation Internet

Thomas C. Schmidt
t.schmidt@ieee.org
HAW Hamburg



Agenda

Motivation

- ➔ Mobility Paradigm & Target Applications
- ➔ Key Issues & Approaches
- ➔ Limits of MIPv4

Basic Mobile IPv6

Protocol Improvements & Development

Current Status, Conclusions & Future Trends



MIPv6 Released – Mobility on the Rise?



Historic: What may we expect?

- o Devices using Home Address while away
- o 'Workspaces' roaming between local subnets
- o 3GPP Mobiles operating IPv6 Data Service
 - + Improvements on handover performance
 - + Improved security protocols
 - + Cheap availability of WLAN, Wimax, DVB-IPDC
 - + ...
- o VoIP/VCoIP conferencing: real-time mobility
- o Streaming & group communication by Mobile Multicast



IP Mobility: Challenges & Terms

Objective:

- Application persistence while roaming between IP subnets / providers
- Preserve upper layer (L 4+) communication when changing IP subnets

Key Aspects:

- **Mobile Node** (MN) globally addressable: fixed **Home Address** (HoA)
- **Home Agent** (HA) to permanently represent MN at home network
- Mobile Node locally addressable: changing **Care of Address** (CoA)
- Sustain partner sessions: update **Correspondent Nodes** (CN)
- Enable efficient communication (route optimisation)

Key Mobility Approaches

o Application: SIP Handover

- SIP-server as application specific home agent
- Requires mobility-aware applications
- Works only with SIP

o Mobile IP


- Stateless, transport transparent handover

Mobile IPv4: IP Mobility Support for IPv4 (RFC 3344)

Mobile IPv6: Mobility Support in IPv6 (RFC 3775, now 6275)




Limits of Mobile IPv4



- o IPv4's Design Stationary (Routing-Updates Slow)
- o Implementation of Mobility Services: Tunnelling via Home Agent
- o IPv6 Potential:
 - Several Addresses (2 for Mobile Node, many for Mobile Networks)
 - Flexible, Extendable Architecture



Mobile IPv4



Agenda

🕒 Motivation

🕒 Basic Mobile IPv6

➔ Location & Handover Management

➔ Basic Security


➔ Implementation & Deployment

🕒 Protocol Improvements & Development

🕒 Current Status, Conclusions & Future Trends



Mobile IPv6



Basic Mobile IPv6


- o MN's stateless configuration of Care of Address in a foreign network and **Binding Updates** (BUs) with Home Agent (HA) and Correspondent (CNs).
- o MN, CN & HA keep **Binding Cache Tables**.
- o Home-Agent needed as Address Dispatcher.

MIPv6 transparently operates address changes on IP layer by:

- o MN continues to use its original Home Address in a **Destination Option Header**, thereby hiding different routes to the socket layer.
- o CNs continues to use Home Address of the MN, placing it in a **Routing Header** (Type 2) as Source Route via the current CoA .




Mobile IPv6 Signaling




MIPv6 Transparent Communication MN → CN

- o Application persistence requires continuous use of HoA
- o Infrastructure requires use of topologically correct source address: CoA
- o MIPv6 stack moves HoA to Destination Option Header



MIPv6 Transparent Communication CN → MN

- o Application persistence requires continuous use of HoA
- o Route optimisation operates with CoA
- o MIPv6 extracts CoA from Binding Cache and initiates source routing to HoA via CoA



Handover Security

Binding Updates place a severe security challenge:

MN must provide strong authentication


- o BU with HA: IPSec ESP Security Association (strong coupling)
- o BU with CN: Return Routability Procedure (lightweight coupling)

to test correctness of MN's HoA and CoA

- HoTI/HoT: MN(Cookie) → HA → CN (HToken, Cookie) → HA → MN
- CoTI/CoT: MN (Cookie) → CN (CToken, Cookie) → MN
- Finally do BU with Hash(HToken, CToken) invertable by CN



Securing Binding Updates: Return Routability



Deployment Status

- o Many tests in labs and experiments
- o Experimental Open Access Networks
- o US: Cellular Networks
- o Public experimental HA-service from Nautilus (Wide) project: www.nautilus6.org
- o Operators favour: SIP + NAT ... IMS
- o Firewall issues:
 - ESP filters
 - Port filter states: BU (partly) independent of forwarding
 - Debate on source routing / routing headers



Agenda

🕒 Motivation

🕒 Basic Mobile IPv6

🕒 Protocol Improvements & Development

➔ Transparent Mobility: PMIPv6

➔ Handover Acceleration: HMIPv6 & FMIPv6

➔ Predictive versus Reactive: Analysis of Handover Performance

➔ Secure Enhancement of Route Optimisation

➔ Multicast Mobility Extensions

🕒 Current Status, Conclusions & Future Trends




Transparent Mobility: Proxy Mobile IPv6 (RFC 5213)

Objective: Support IPv6 Mobility without Client Support/Implementation

Approach: Network-operated Tunnel Management – PMIPv6

- Local Mobility Anchor (LMA ↔ HA) and Mobile Access Gateway (MAG ↔ AR) make tunnel follow the MN
- IP address of MN remains unchanged at handovers
- Routing twisted: MAG uses policy-routing based on MNs ID
- LMA attains role of regional gateway like in 3/4GPP telco networks

Proxy Mobile IPv6 (RFC 5213)



Performance: Handover Steps

1. Link Layer Handover
2. L3 Movement Discovery
3. Local Addressing: Form a New CoA
4. Duplicate Address Detection
5. Binding Update with Home Agent
6. Binding Update with Correspondent Node



VoIP/VCoIP Real-Time Requirements

! Latency $\approx < 100$ ms

! Jitter $\approx < 50$ ms


! Packet loss $\approx < 1$ %

! Interruption: 100 ms ≈ 1 spoken syllable


→ 100 ms are critical bound



Local Handover Measurements: Empirical Results



Local Handover Acceleration: L2-Trigger & DAD Suppression



IP-Config: Reduce

- MAX_RA_DELAY_TIME $\approx 1 - 5$ ms
- MAX_RTR_SOLICITATION_DELAY $\approx 1 - 5$ ms

Problem:

Binding Updates are strongly topology dependent



MIPv6 Handover: Topology Problem

o Generally HA and CN are at Significant Distance

o Handover Time: (t_x is RTT MN \leftrightarrow X)

$$t_{handoff} = t_{local} + t_{BU-of-HA} + t_{BU-of-CN}$$
$$\approx t_{local} + \frac{3}{2} t_{CN} + 2t_{HA}$$

o Jitter Enhancement: $\frac{Jitter_{handoff}}{Jitter_{stationary}} \approx \frac{t_{HA} + t_{CN}}{t_{CN}}$

o Essential: Eliminate HA/CN



RTT Dependence

Handover Acceleration: HMIPv6 & FMIPv6

Hierarchical Mobile IPv6

- o Mobility Anchor Points (MAPs) as domain wise HA proxies
 - MN communicates via bi-dir tunnel with MAP
 - Intra-domain (micro-)mobility invisible to outside world
- o Inter-domain HO requires regular BUs via MAPs


Fast Mobile IPv6

- o Handover Management at Access Routers
 - Predictive HO based on L2:L3 topology map, pre-configures New CoA
 - Reactive HO as fallback
- o BUs operated asynchronously


Both approaches resolve topological dependences



Micro-Mobility with HA Proxies: Hierarchical MIPv6 (RFC 5380)



Edge Handover Management: Fast MIPv6 (RFC 5568)



Handover Analysis: Predictive versus Reactive


Relevant criteria

- ▶ Handover performance: packet loss, delay + jitter
- ▶ Number of performed handovers
- ▶ Number of processed handovers
- ▶ Robustness
- ▶ Handover Costs



Handover Performance

Simple analytical model:



- o Compare reactive vers. predictive handover
- o Characteristic to problem: Router distance t_{l3}
- o Charac. to predictive HO:

$$(t_{Ant} - 2t_{l3}) + (t_{L2} - t_{l3})$$
- o Charac. to reactive HO:

$$t_{l3} + t_{L2}$$



More detailed ...

o Reactive Handover:

$$\text{Packet loss} \propto t_{L2} + t_{local-IP} + t_{m_2} + t_{l_3}$$

$$\text{Additional arrival delay} = t_{l_3} + t_{m_2} - t_{m_1}$$

o Predictive Handover (successful):

$$\text{Packet loss} \propto \Delta^-t + \max(\Delta t + t_{L2} + t_{m_2} - t_{l_3}, 0)$$

$$\text{Additional arrival delay} = t_{l_3} + t_{m_2} - t_{m_1}$$

where

$$\Delta^\pm t = \max(\pm t_{Ant} \mp 2t_{l_3} \mp t_{m_1}, 0), \text{ and}$$

$$\Delta t = \Delta^+ t - \Delta^- t.$$




Packet Loss Function


L2 Delay: 50 ms

Traffic:

CBR at 1 Pkt/10 ms



Comparative Samples




Packet Loss: Stochastic Simulation

- o Constant bit rate traffic from CN/HA (at 10 ms)
- o Random perturbations (ξ) at each link
- o Parameters:
 - Anticipation Time: $\langle x \rangle = * \text{ ms}, \xi = 30 \text{ ms}$
 - L2 Handoff: $\langle x \rangle = 50 \text{ ms}, \xi = 10 \text{ ms}$
 - Local Links: $\langle x \rangle = 2 \text{ ms}, \xi = 1 \text{ ms}$



Packet Loss



Why is Reality Worse?

Analytical Model did not Account for

- o Geometry

- o Link Perturbation

- o Limitations in Completing HO Negotiation



Number of Handovers

Relevant quantities:

- Cell residence time
- Call holding time
- AR-to-MAP ratio

Modelling assumptions:

- Cell residence & call holding time exp. distributed (homogeneous distribution)




Expected # of Handovers

Analytical result:


ρ = Call-to-mobility
factor

k = AR-to-MAP ratio

$$E[HO] = \frac{1}{k\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\rho}}$$



Handover Predictions: Stochastic Simulation




Models:

Random Waypoint
Varying Geometry


Random Direction
Varying Geometry
Varying Speeds




Mean Handover Frequencies: Random Waypoint Model



Mean Handover Frequencies: Random Direction Model



Erroneous Prediction Yields




Handover Security Problems

- o RRP vulnerable to Man-in-the-Middle attacks
- o Degrades handover performance
 - RRP tightens topological dependence
- o Agnostic of FMIPv6
- o Incompatible with Multicast



Problem: Man in the Middle



The Core of the Problem?

For Authentication

A Mobile Node must proof ownership of HoA


But: Certification Infrastructure (PKI) is out of scope

Idea in IPv6:

Cryptographically Generated Addresses (Aura, Castellucia, Montenegro & Petander – RFC 3972):


- o Generate public/private key pair: e, d
 - o Generate host-ID from public key: 64 sha1(e)
- ➔ Packets now can authenticate their address (and content) self-consistently!

CGA Packet Authentication



Binding Update

Enhanced Route Optimization for Mobile IPv6 (RFC 4866)




Base header is Home Address unaware.



Binding Update

Enhanced Route Optimization for Mobile IPv6 (RFC 4866)




The destination receives the Home Address in the Destination Options Header.



Binding Update

Enhanced Route Optimization for Mobile IPv6 (RFC 4866)




The update itself is stored in the Mobility Header.



Binding Update

Enhanced Route Optimization for Mobile IPv6 (RFC 4866)




CGA options verify the HA and sign the packet



CGA-Authenticated BU (RFC 4866)

Initial HoA-Reachability Test
Further on per Handover:



Multicast Mobility: Problems & Objectives

Multicast Mobility in MIPv6: Problem Statement

Provide Seamless Multicast Services to and from MNs

- o Approach native multicast forwarding in an infrastructure-compliant manner
- o At Listeners:
 - Ensure multicast reception in visited networks
 - Organize context transfer between mcast-enabled access networks
- o At Sources:
 - Sustain address transparency at end nodes (address duality problem)
 - Ensure persistence of receiver contact (decoupling problem)
 - Bridge tardy tree reconstruction/transformation procedures
- o Focus on deployable solutions, minimize protocol extensions

Multicast Mobility Approaches

o Remote Subscription

- Show all movement by local multicast subscription

o Bi-directional Tunnelling

- Hide all movement by tunnelling via Home Agent

o Agent Based

- Compromise: Intermediate agents shield Mobile
- Approaches: Extend unicast expediting schemes
M-FMIPv6, M-HMIPv6, ...



Agenda

- 🕒 Motivation
- 🕒 Basic Mobile IPv6
- 🕒 Protocol Improvements & Development
- 🕒 Current Status, Conclusions & Future Trends



Status: Where are we today?

- o Internet Mobility
 - Mobile IPv6 - RFC 3775 (June 2004, widely implemented)
- o Real-Time Mobility
 - FMIPv6 – RFCs 5268 (June 2008, updated to standard track)
 - HMIPv6 – RFC 5380 (Oct. 2008, updated to standard track)
 - Enhanced Route Optimisation – RFC 4866 (May 2007)
- o Carrier-Operated Mobility for MIPv6-unaware Nodes
 - PMIPv6 – RFC 5213 (PtP Links only, August 2008)
- o Multicast Mobility
 - WG in IETF (Multimob), first RFC 6224 for PMIPv6
- o Multihoming & MIPv6 – on debate



Conclusions & Future Trends

- o MIPv6 is about ready for deployment ...
... and a beautiful illustration of IPv6's potentials
- o MIPv6 operates in end-to-end paradigm, a conflict with operator concepts
- o PMIPv6 could serve as a “mediating protocol”, deployment in preparation
- o Key issue of developing the mobile regime:
Gain control on end-devices





References

- Hesham Soliman: *Mobile IPv6*, Addison Wesley, 2004.
- Rajeev Koodli, Charles Perkins: *Mobile Internetworking with IPv6*, John Wiley, 2007.
- www.rfc-editor.org
- Schmidt, Wählisch: *Mobility in IPv6: Standards and Upcoming Trends*, Uptimes III/2007, Lehmanns/GUUG e.V., September 2007.
- Schmidt, Wählisch: *Predictive versus Reactive – Analysis of Handover Performance and Its Implications on IPv6 and Multicast Mobility*, Telecomm. Systems, 30, 1-3, Nov., 2005.

