

draft-ietf-behave-nat-mib-07

Simon Perreault <simon.perreault@viagenie.ca>

Tina Tsou <tina.tsou.zouting@huawei.com>

Senthil Sivakumar <ssenthil@cisco.com>

IETF 87, Orlando
BEHAVE meeting

2013-07-29

Status

- Since IETF 86, went from -05 to -07
- WGLC
 - Many good comments from a few people (THANKS!)
 - Many changes
 - Some open questions remaining
- Consensus call on this assertion:
 - “RFC 4008 should be historic and a new MIB module is needed NATs (to cover both CGNs and non-CGNs).”

Two possibilities

a) Declare RFC 4008 Historic

- Brand new MIB, no relation with 4008

b) Revise RFC 4008

- Add new objects to the 4008 MIB
- Mark 4008 objects as deprecated

- Authors initially did a), then b) following guidance from WG.
- Authors' opinion: For all practical purposes, RFC 4008 is useless. Justification in section 3.1 of draft.
 - ... but don't really care whether we choose a) or b).

Relationship with logging

- Notifications currently in MIB:
 - natNotifPoolWatermarkLow
 - natNotifPoolWatermarkHigh
 - natNotifMappings
 - natNotifAddrMappings
 - natNotifSubscriberMappings
- All notifications are of the form “(value of counter) crosses (value of threshold)”
 - Counters are read-only objects.
 - Thresholds are read-write objects.
 - (Thresholds are the only read-write objects we introduce.)
- Authors' position (and WG consensus as we remember it):
 - It is good to have SNMP alerts for these events.
 - These events should also be logged, in addition to many other events.
 - Some overlap in functionality is OK. Each protocol serves a different purpose.

Realms vs logging

- The realm IDs used in the NAT MIB must be the same as those used in the logging draft.
 - Is there any problem with this?
 - Express it by having each draft reference the other?