



# An Alternative Approach for Mobile IP Networks

Devan Rehunathan



# Mobile Networks

- Relevance



# Mobile Networks

- Problems

- Existing solutions:  
ILNP[8] vs NEMO[9]

Application

FQDN, IP Address

Transport

IP Address


Network

IP Address

Link


MAC Address

Today's  
Network Stack




University  
of  
St Andrews


# NEtwork MObility



# Identifier Locator Network Protocol




# Identifier Locator Network Protocol




Using Naming [1,5] through ILNP

Today's Network Stack





# The Experiment

- London Circle Line




- Case 1: MR only
- Case 2: MR with MNNs
- Case 3: MR with MNNs and CN

# Results Obtained: NEMO






# Results Obtained: ILNP




# Conclusion

- ILNP and NEMO are very different
- ILNP resolves core IP address problem [6,7]
- NEMO works around it with tunnels
- Which is better?
- Control packet –wise about the same
- Tip of the iceberg
- Where do we go from here?



# References

- [1] A. Jonsson, M. Folke, and B. Ahlgren. The Split Naming /Forwarding Network Architecture. In First Swedish National Computer Networking Workshop (SNCNW), Arlandastad, Sweden, September 2003.
- [2] B. Quoitin, L. Iannone, C. de Launois, and O. Bonaventure. Evaluating the Benefits of the Locator/Identifier Separation. In *Proceedings of MobiArch (ACM SIGCOMM Workshop)*, Kyoto, Japan, August 2007.
- [3] R. Ramanathan. Mobility Support for Nimrod : Challenges and Solution Approaches. RFC 2103 (Informational), February 1997.
- [4] F. Al-Shraideh. Host Identity Protocol. In *ICNICONSMCL '06: Proceedings of the International Conference on Networking, International Conference on Systems and International Conference on Mobile Communications and Learning Technologies*, page 203, Washington, DC, USA, 2006. IEEE Computer Society.
- [5] D. D. Clark, K. Sollins, J. Wroclawski, and T. Faber. Addressing Reality: An Architectural Response to Real-World Demands on the Evolving Internet. In *FDNA '03: Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM workshop on Future directions in network architecture*, pages 247–257, New York, NY, USA, 2003. ACM.
- [6] B. Carpenter. Architectural Principles of the Internet. RFC 1958 (Informational), June 1996.
- [7] C. J. Bennett, S. W. Edge, and A. J. Hinchley. IEN 1: Issues in the interconnection of datagram networks, July 29, 1977. URL <http://www.cis.ohio-state.edu/htbin/ien/ien1.html>. This document is also known as INDRA note 637 and PSPWN 76.
- [8] R. Atkinson, S. Bhatti, S. Hailes, "Harmonised Resilience, Security and Mobility Capability for IP" Proc. MILCOM2008 - 27th IEEE Military Communications Conference , San Diego, USA 17-19 November 2008.
- [9] C. J. Bernardos, A. D. L. Oliva, M. Calderón, D. von Hugo, and H. Kahle. NEMO: Network Mobility. Bringing ubiquity to the Internet access. IEEE INFOCOM 2006, April 2006. demonstration.



# Questions?

<http://www.cs.st-andrews.ac.uk/~dr>

[dr@cs.st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:dr@cs.st-andrews.ac.uk)

