

DYMO, SMF, NHDP and OLSR MIBs

Brian Adamson¹ Ian D. Chakeres² Thomas Clausen³
Robert G. Cole⁴ Sean Harnedy⁵ Joe Macker¹

¹Naval Research Laboratory – {adamson,jmacker}@nrl.navy.mil

²CenGen, Inc. – ian.chakeres@gmail.com

³LIX, Ecole Polytechnique – T.Clausen@computer.org

⁴Johns Hopkins University – robert.cole@jhuapl.edu

⁵Booz Allen Hamilton – harnedy_sean@bah.com

26 March 2009 / MANET WG, IETF

Introduction

Four MIBs related to MANET WG protocols:

- DYMO MIB <ietf-manet-dymo-mib-02.txt> [1]
- SMF MIB <ietf-cole-manet-smf-mib-02.txt> [2]
- NHDP MIB <ietf-cole-manet-nhdp-mib-01.txt> [3]
- OLSR MIB <ietf-cole-manet-olsr-mib-01.txt> [4]

Updates

- DYMO MIB – small update to dymoRoutingTable and a few object type and access cleanup.
- SMF MIB – added CapabilitiesGroup, split out ReportsGroup, added IF performance tables, added config and state tables related to multicast addresses support, added Performance objects related to DPD, split objects and tables for IPv4 and IPv6.
- NHDP MIB – developed Configuration and State Groups (drastic clean up and reworking). Added NeighborIfIndex and NeighborId for indexing cleanup purposes.
- OLSR MIB – (drastic rewrite) aligned to the organization and indexing in the NHDP MIB.

Next Work Items

- DYMO MIB – is near complete (depending upon answers to the Questions below). Need to spend some thought against Notifications.
- SMF MIB – is pretty well fleshed out, except for smfGenReportTable and Notifications. Will pull IpTables, need to consider need to break up Conformance, need some amount of review.
- NHDP MIB – (next) needs work on Performance Group.
- OLSR MIB – (next) needs work on Performance Group.

Questions

- Are RMON-style reports desirable across all the MIBs? (These allow for off-line performance monitoring and reporting as distinct from polling methods.)
- Do these reports need to be developed within each individual MIB, or is it possible to build a `manetReportingMib` covering all MANET performance objects?
- SMF MIB is a framework structure (in some sense) with a `CapabilitiesGroup`; objects related to supported RSSAs are necessarily to be developed within separate MIBs. Is this OK?
- DYMO MIB is currently the only chartered MIB work. The other MIBs are now in pretty good shape. Should we move the other MIBs into the WG chartered activities?

References

- 1 Harnedy, S., Cole, R.G. and I.D. Chakeres, *Definition of Managed Objects for the DYMO Manet Routing Protocol*, IETF Draft, <draft-ietf-manet-dymo-mib-02.txt>, February 2009.
- 2 Cole, R.G. Macker, J. and B. Adamson, *Definition of Managed Objects for the Manet Simplified Multicast Framework Relay Set Process*, IETF Draft, <draft-cole-manet-smf-mib-02.txt>, February 2009.
- 3 Cole, R.G. and I.D. Chakeres, *Definition of Managed Objects for the Neighborhood Discovery Protocol*, IETF Draft, <draft-cole-manet-nhdp-mib-01.txt>, February 2009.
- 4 Cole, R.G. and T. Clausen, *Definition of Managed Objects for the Optimised Link State Routing version 2 Protocol*, IETF Draft, <draft-cole-manet-olsr-mib-01.txt>, February 2009.