= Minutes for the a+p bar BoF held at IETF77 in Anaheim =

- **When?**
  March 22\(^{nd}\), 2010 at 18h00 (~2 hours meeting)

- **Where?**
  Hilton Hotel Anaheim, 4\(^{th}\) Floor

- **Subject**
  Understand why we failed to find a home for the a+p work within IETF and discuss the next steps to carry on this effort (if we still motivated)

- **Participants**

1. Alain Durand (Comcast)
2. Arifumi Matsumoto (NTT)
3. Behcet Sarikaya (Huawei)
4. Chris Donley (Cablelabs)
5. Dan Wing (Cisco)
6. Dean Cheng (Huawei)
7. Francis Dupont (ISC)
8. Fuad A binader (Nokia)
9. Gabor Bajko (Nokia)
10. Guillaume Gaulon (Orange Labs)
11. Hiroyuki Ashida (ITS communications Inc.)
12. Hui Deng (China Mobile)
13. Jacni Qin (ZTE)
14. Jari Arkko (Ericsson)
15. Jouni Korhonen (Nokia Siemens Networks)
16. Juergen Quittek (NEC Europe Ltd.)
17. Lars Eggert (Nokia Research Center)
18. Lee Howard (Time Warner Cable)
19. Li Lianyuan (China Mobile)
20. Miya Kohno (Juniper)
21. Mohamed Boucadair (France Telecom)
22. Olaf Bonness (Deutsche Telekom)
23. Olivier Vautrin (Juniper)
24. Paul Selkirk (ISC)
25. Ralph Droms (Cisco)
26. Rémi Despres (Independent)
27. Satoru Matsushima (Softbank)
28. Shingo Kudo (SOFTBANK TELECOM Corp.)
29. Teemu Savolainen (Nokia)
30. Tomohiro Fujisaki (NTT Japan)
31. Tomoya Yoshida (NTT Communications)
32. Yiu Lee (Comcast)

- **Agenda**

  Introduction (Med)
  Objectives of the meeting (Med)
  - Understand why we have failed to sell our proposals.
  - How to proceed: (1) Abandon, (2) redefine a clear problem statement and rationale documents and then target a second BoF in Maastricht
  - Agree on the next steps: (1) Who will do what? (2) Operational Issues (3) What to do with all edited port range/a+p/sam/etc documents?
  Open discussion (all)
• **Main discussed points**

Not all the elements that have been discussed during the meeting are captured in these notes.

- Why aplusp BoF has failed? R. Despres provided a summary about the Hiroshima BoF and mentioned that the scope was restricted to DS-Lite and also that the presentation of the D. Thaler about issues does not refer to a given a+p flavour. L. Eggert stated that mobile presentation was a mistake. R. Droms mentioned that the scope of the BoF was restricted to DS-Lite to limit the scope so as to be focused on a concrete use case. Then, Y. Lee reported that a lot of people think that the routing is impacted by the port and they are frightened about this.

- Having a second chance for a+p: Med asked whether it is possible to give a second chance for the defenders of a+p to prepare a second BoF. R. Droms mentioned that there were already two BoFs that have been organised. Med mentioned that the first shara BoF was a non forming WG BoF. L. Eggert confirmed.

- Main added values of A+P compared to a NAT-based scheme: L. Eggert asked what are the main advantages of this solution. O. Vautrin answered that that solution is stateless. Several elements have been stated and discussed: optimised logging, legal storage issues, robustness and service availability, service evolution and hurdles related to ALGs in CGNs, keepalive to maintain NAT entries … During that discussion it has been concluded that advantages of a+p need to be identified and assessed.

- it was indicated that it would worth keeping the a+p concept alive at least until SPs could look deeper into the possibilities it may have

- Do we need a standard for a+p: J. Quitten stated that we may not need a standard in a first step and once we have implementation then we can come back to IETF. P. Selkirk asked whether he is suggesting to adopt the 6RD model. Juergen mentioned also that they will release a solution soon and that the support of a+p is not expensive.

- Discussion on whether a routing entry/DHCP record is a state or not.

- Does PCP (Port Control Protocol) solves the problem: discussion focused on whether using PCP to delegate port range(s) to the CPE (only one level of NAT will be enforced in the CPE while the CGN will only forward the traffic to the appropriate CPE without NAT) would mitigate some of the identified issues.

• **Conclusions**

- The advantages of the proposed a+p solution(s) compared to a NAT-based scheme should be identified.

- These advantages should be balanced. A set of criteria to evaluate the importance of claimed advantages are to be proposed.

- An hybrid mode DS-Lite/delegating port ranges **may** mitigate some of the drawback of a CGN-based solution.

- The faith of the documents describing a+p was not discussed, lack of time.

• **Action points**

Edit a problem Statement (Juergen to propose a first version of the document). [[Note: Rémi suggested also to have a taxonomy of the proposed a+p solutions]]