



Traceroute Metrics and Data Model

draft-niccolini-ippm-storetraceroutes-02

Saverio Niccolini, Sandra Tartarelli, Juergen Quittek
Network Laboratories, NEC Europe Ltd.
{niccolini|tartarelli|quittek}@netlab.nec.de

Martin Swany
University of Delaware, Newark
swany@UDel.Edu

Parallel work at Global Grid Forum (GGF)

At the last meeting we discovered that there is similar work going on in parallel at the Global Grid Forum (GGF)

- Both activities have similar objectives
- The chosen approaches differ
 - GGF has a more advanced structure for data model
 - based on templates for configuration elements (they appear once and then are referenced as metadata by results information elements)
 - our structure includes configuration elements in current XML file
 - a design choice made without strong preference
 - IETF has a more advanced information model
 - more attributes, more properties of attributes,
 - e.g. restrictions on field values
- Authors of GGF document contacted
 - started collaboration with Martin Swamy (University of Delaware)
- We do not have info on publication intentions of this work at GGF

Changes from version -01 to -02

- Data model design considerations
 - Section 6.1 already presented a complete XML schema for storing traceroute measurements (IETF approach)
 - Section 6.2 is new and sketches an alternative approach to design the XML schema
 - the alternative scheme is based on work done in parallel at Global Grid Forum (GGF).
 - its most relevant feature is that it uses templates, i.e. configuration elements appear once and then are referenced as metadata by results information elements
 - a preliminary sketch of how an XML schema combining the IETF and the GGF approaches would look like is also included in section 6.2.
 - Only one of these two sections will remain in the end.

Issues

- Intention at GGF:
 - is publication as “GGF standard” intended?
- Shall we merge the two approaches?
 - take the GGF structure and the IETF info model?
- Where to publish it?
 - at IETF, at GGF, or consistently at both?
 - formatting might be different, but core sections would be the same
- Naming issue
 - The IETF approach uses names which are compatible with DISMAN-TRACEROUTE-MIB (RFC 2925)
 - The GGF uses a different naming scheme
 - Should a common naming scheme not be possible a solution has to be worked out
 - A possibility is to insert in the respective recommendations a template for a converter that could be used for IETF-GGF interoperability purposes
 - not really desirable

Shall this become
an IPPM work item?