

OLSRv2 Update

draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2-15.txt

Thomas Clausen, Christopher Dearlove,
Philippe Jacquet, Ulrich Herberg

(The Usual) Trip Down Memory Lane...

- 98/11/18 - draft-ietf-manet-olsr-00
- 03/10/13 - [RFC3626] published
- 05/07/11 - draft-clausen-manet-olsrv2-00
- 05/10/20 - draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2-00
- 12/04/14 - WGLC Requested
- 12/05/10 - WGLC Terminated
- 12/10/15 - draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2-15
- 12/06/04 - Publication Requested
- **12/07/25 - AD Review**
- **12/07/25 - IETF LC Requested**
- **12/08/22 - IETF LC Terminates**

-14 to -15

- Editorial nitpickery (may->MAY, consistent use of RFC5444 terminology,)

AD(rian) Review Comments (1)

- “After the discussion on the list about the impact on the status of RFC 3626, I suggest adding the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph in Section 1:

This document does not obsolete [RFC3626] which is left in place for further experimentation.”

➡OK, will be added to next revision

AD(rian) Review Comments (2)

- “Section 2
Anycast addresses MAY be considered as
routable addresses.

This is fine, but it would be helpful to explain why this is "MAY" not may. The upper case gives a feeling that anycast addresses can be present and normally not considered as routable, but sometimes (for some unspecified reason) and implementation/deployment will consider them as routable.”

- ➡ Suggest transforming MAY to may
No real reason for using MAY in the first place....

AD(rian) Review Comments (3)

- “I like the appendixes and the fact that you have taken the time to create examples. But appendix D *[ed: Constraints]* contains 2119 language and this jars a bit.”
 - ➔ Done as in RFC6130 - would like to be consistent herewith
 - ➔ The processing in OLSRv2 will ensure that these constraints are met. This appendix specifies the constraints which an external process **MUST** satisfy, should it wish to update OLSRv2 information bases
 - ➔ Prefer to **not change the spirit** of this
 - ➔ AD(rian) on Jabber:

“When we use 2119 language in requirement specs, we often modify the boilerplate to say something like: Although this is not a protocol specification, this document uses language from RFC 2119 to make the requirements clear. Would something like that at the top of App D be possible?”

AD(rian) Review Comments (4)

- “To a lesser extent, appendix E *[ed: Flow and congestion Control]* bothered me and I wondered whether you would consider moving it to be a main section of the document.”
 - ➔ Done as in RFC6130 - would like to be consistent herewith
 - ➔ Not prescriptive in nature
 - ➔ Prefer to **not change**
 - ➔ AD(rian) on Jabber:
“Hi, reasonable replies. Mainly wanted to get the issues considered (i.e., I am not requiring changes). App E we can consider discussion closed”

OLSRv2 Status

- Believe that all AD(rian) issues resolved
- IETF Last Call ends 12/08/22
- Hannes Gredler doing RTG-DIR review
(<http://www.ietf.org/iesg/directorate/routing.html>)

OLSRv2 Metrics Rationale

draft-dearlove-olsrv2-metrics

Christopher Dearlove, Thomas Clausen,
Philippe Jacquet

History

- 03/10/13 - [RFC3626] published - minimum-hop-routes
- draft-clausen-manet-olsrv2/draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2 initially concentrated on improving other aspects of OLSRv2, up until -11 (April 2010)
- Recognized that minimum-hop-routes not always good enough:
 - draft-dearlove-olsrv2-metrics-00, July 2007:
"This is why and how we suggest doing"
 - Continued refinements up to -05 (June 2010)
 - The "how we suggest doing it" folded into draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2-11 (April 2012)

Rationale

- draft-dearlove-olsrv2-metrics did more than describe how to add metrics to OLSRv2,
- In particular, it also discussed “why” specific design-choices were made:
- This "why" material not part of draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2
- If WG agrees (some positive response in Paris) suggest recording this material as intended Informational RFC.

To This End...

- Created new draft-dearlove-olsrv2-metrics-06.
- Change in purpose: explaining just the why.
Different introduction.
- Change in tense: not "will add to OLSRv2" but "is included in OLSRv2".
- Incorporates the changes made between -05 and OLSRv2 (-15).

Way Forward

- Would like to request WG adoption
- Would expect to be ready for WGLC very quickly (well before IETF'85):
 - Documents that which was already done in OLSRv2
 - WGLC on OLSRv2 already completed - consensus
 - It's going for informational, i.e., non-prescriptive.