WG Last Call on
NEMO Terminology
draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-01.txt
and
NEMO Requirements
draft-ietf-nemo-requirements-02.txt

Thierry Ernst

August 6, 2004

1 NEMO Terminology Issues (draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-01)

1.1 Last Published Version: draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-01.txt

1.2 Current Version of draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-02-pre.txt

Last Published Version: draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-01.txt
Current Version: draft-ietf-nemo-terminology-02-pre.txt

1.3 Issue 1: Comments Marcelo 040229

See http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/nemo/current/msg00910.html
msg00910.html

Prop 1: Self-contained document: copy-paste the definition of MR, Mobile Network Node, egress interface, ingress interface. [OPEN]

Prop 2: say that LFN are fixed nodes unables to change their point of attachment [DONE]

Prop 3: say that LMN has a HoA taken from NEMO-Prefix (and VMN has a HoA not taken from NEMO-link [REJECTED: Mobile Nodes don't not necessarily use MIPv6, it

could be an ad-hoc node using a MANET routing protocol]

Prop 4: Discussion about multi-addressed nodes: all nodes could be considered "multi-homed", then. [See Issue 6]

Prop 5: Delete multi-addressed [DONE. See Issue 6]

Prop 6: Delete multi-sited [DONE. OK since the MNNs might not perceived that the mobile network has multiple IPS. See Issue 6]

Prop 7: The 2 parts of the definitions in Section 5.3 and Section 4 don't match [DONE. See Issue 6]

Prop 8: Section 3: preclude ¡-¿ imply [DONE]

Prop 9: Clarification in Host Mobilty Support, and NEMO Basic Support [DONE]

Prop 10: Split references into normative / non normative [TODO]

1.4   Issue 2: NEMO-Prefix vs MNP

Some people support MNP (iniial term, expanding to "Mobile Network Prefix").

The editor supports NEMO-prefix, a bit longer, but consistent with other NEMO terms. Also argues it was proposed at the IETF meeting, and approved (or put it simply, not disapproved)

People supporting MNP: Vijay, Alex

People supporting NEMO-prefix: Thierry

1.5   Issue 3: root-MR vs TLMR

Some people support TLMR (initial term, expanding to "Top-Level Mobile Router").

The editor support root-MR, more consistent with parent-MR, sub-MR, etc. Also argues it was proposed at the IETF meeting, and approved (or put it simply, not disapproved)

1.6   Issue 4: Comments Vijay 040721

Prop1: only keep the first sentence in the abstract [DONE]

Prop 2: expand LFN, VMN, LMN (section functional terms) [DONE]

Prop 3. not redefine i-face and e-face. Ingress and Egress are widely used terms, and everybody understands them.

Prop 4: NEMO-prefix vs MNP [see Issue 2]

Prop 5: NEMO-link: Vijay: does it include nested mobile networks ? [OPEN]

Prop 6: "Node behind the MR" Vijay this thinks it's not a term and should be removed [DONE]

Prop 7: NEMO-enabled: Vijay finds it hard to understand. Does this node do some kind of RO inside the NEMO (without involving MIP6 HA ?). Would like to know if there was discussion on the ML about this

New Text: Added that in NEMO Basic Support only MR and HA are NEMO-enabled [SEE UPDATED DEFINTION in -02-pre]

Prop 8: Terms from draft-ietf-nemo-home-network-models only appear in that draft, and are difficult to explain without a figure [OPEN - need text to introduce these terms]

1.7   Issues 5: New terms "Plastic" and "Solid"

From Pascal Thubert, July 30th

The RRH draft has a concept of "solid" NEMO which means that a nested structure of mobile and non mobile routers is moving as a whole with no inner topological deformation. You may think of a term like "plastic" for a structure that moves as a whole but with inner movements as well, like a swarm. I believe that such terms are useful for the RO discussion.

Thierry: isn't it a bit imature ? [would you propose a definition, indeed ?]

1.8   Issue 6: Multihoming Section

Should all the text remains in the terminology draft, some moved to the multihoming draft, some removed ?

Prop 1 [Thierry]: Remove the terms "multi-rooted-NEMO, multi-egress-addressed, multi-egress-inferfaced, etc" as they don't seem to be useful and anyway are somewhat too long. [DONE]

Prop 2 [Thierry]: keep a light definition in the draft, and leave draft-ieft-nemo-multhoming-issues room to elaborate.[DONE]

Prop 3: [Thierry]: say that a multihomed mobile network is a mobile network where several NEMO-prefixes are advertised to MNNs. [DONE]

Prop 4: [Thierry] Nested and Multihomed Mobile Networks: is draft-ietf-nemo-terminology the right location for the two scenarios ?

1.9   Issue 7: Add Correspondent Router

[Proposition Thierry] To discuss RO.

1.10   Issue 8: Add Definition Split Network

[Proposition Thierry]

1.11   Issue 9: Repeating Definitions and Self-contained Document

[Proposition Thierry]. Several times, it has been said that documents must be self-contained. So, while some terms (MR, Mobile Network, etc) are defined in RFC3553, wouldn't that mean that those should better be copy-pasted in the terminology document or better referred to "as defined in RFC abcd"?

1.12   Issue 10: Add Depth of a Nested-NEMO

"Depth" may be useful to deal with Nested-NEMO

1.13 Issue 11: Shall we add more terms used in the RO discussion, security, etc?

1.14 Issue 12: Improve Figures [TODO]

2 NEMO Requirements Issues (draft-ietf-nemo-requirements-01)

2.1 Current Version of the Draft

Last Published Version: draft-ietf-nemo-requirements-02.txt
Current Version: draft-ietf-nemo-requirements-03-pre.txt NOT YET AVAILABLE

2.2 Issue 1: English Brush UP

Prop 1: Does the draft need an English brush up, if yes, is there any volunteer ?

2.3 Issue 2: One-Liner Requirements

Do one-liner requirements still make sense now ?

2.4 Issue XXX: NO COMMENTS RECEIVED SO FAR