Interface and IP configuration

draft-ietf-netmod-interfaces-cfg-03
draft-ietf-netmod-iana-if-type-01
draft-ietf-netmod-ip-cfg-02

IETF 83
Martin Björklund
mbj@tail-f.com

Interface Configuration

We had WGLC for these documents:

- draft-ietf-netmod-interfaces-cfg-02

- draft-ietf-netmod-iana-if-type-01

Three reviews, resulted in an updated version (-03) of the interfaces document. The main change was clarification of the relationship with IF-MIB.

No more open issues.

IP configuration – Changes from last IETF

In draft-ietf-netmod-ip-cfg-02, we added parameters related to IPv6 stateless autoconfiguration (RFC 4862)

Open Issue #ip-07

RFC 4861 mandates a per-interface config parameter IsRouter.

IP-MIB defines this as ipv6InterfaceForwarding, but also has a global parameter ipv6IpForwarding, that can be used to globally disable forwarding on all interfaces.

Q1. Should we add a per-interface is-router / ip-forwarding leaf?

Q2. Should we also add the global parameter?

Q3. Should we do the same for ipv4? IP-MIB doesn't have per-interface forwarding for ipv4. (Linux supports this).

Open Issue #ip-08

ML discussion summary: we should not add parameters to configure a DHCP client, but maybe we should add parameters to control how the address obtained by DHCP is used.

We already have the manually configured addresses and addresses from stateless autoconfiguration.

Q. Do we need a leaf to control such mechanisms, or can we simply just use all address from all (enabled) mechanisms?

Open Issue #ip-09

It was suggested that we add the following stats objects:

- all addresses on an interface (configured or dynamically assigned)

- RFC 4861, 6.3.2 (per interface)
  - link-mtu
  - cur-hop-limit
  - … and more

- RFC 4861, 5.1 (global)
  - neighbor cache
  - routing table

Q. Should we add stats objects at all? What about duplication of MIB objects?