

Intended Status of draft-ietf-6lo-lowpan-mib

Ulrich Herberg

2014-07-24

Intended Status

- Experimental:
 - RFC 2026: The "Experimental" designation typically denotes a specification that is **part of some research or development effort**. Such a specification is **published for the general information of the Internet technical community** and as an archival record of the work, **subject only to editorial considerations** and to verification that there has been adequate coordination with the standards process (see below). An Experimental specification may be the output of an organized Internet research effort (e.g., a Research Group of the IRTF), an IETF Working Group, or it may be an individual contribution.

Intended Status

- Experimental:
 - Recently, stricter requirements have been enforced by the IESG, although not documented
 - Brian: “In some instances, ADs see Experimental as[...] the basis of an experiment and should contain descriptions of what is being tested.”

Intended Status

- Proposed Standard:
 - RFC 2026: “The entry-level maturity for the standards track is "Proposed Standard". [...] A Proposed Standard specification is **generally stable**, has **resolved known design choices**, is believed to be **well-understood**, has received **significant community review**, and appears to enjoy enough **community interest** to be considered valuable. However, further experience might result in a change or even retraction of the specification before it advances. Usually, **neither implementation nor operational experience is required** for the designation of a specification as a Proposed Standard. However, such experience is highly desirable, and will usually represent a strong argument in favor of a Proposed Standard designation.”

Intended Status

- MIB module itself is just an API (similar to IP MIB)
- Not necessarily tied to SNMP
- Data model has received significant reviews from the WG, is found to be useful, and is stable
- Position in IoT stack:
 - <http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/90/slides/slides-90-6lo-3.pdf>
- Implementation using SNMP on constrained nodes shown at the plugfest
 - <http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/90/slides/slides-90-6lo-8.pdf>
- Sometimes SNMP is not affordable:
 - Other solutions (than SNMP) may be required, e.g.,
draft-vanderstok-core-comi-04 or draft-ietf-netconf-restconf-01
- Going experimental would be if the WG is unsure whether the draft reflects the right set of counters. No concerns have been raised in WGLC about the selection of the counters.

Chairs' Suggestion

- Keep the draft Std. Track
- Add a caveat in the draft that
 - in constrained networks SNMP may not always be affordable
 - A MIB module itself is just a data model and therefore not necessarily tied to SNMP, and that it could be used with other protocols
 - there is at least one known SNMP-based implementation
 - a description of how this MIB module fits into the IoT stack
- Update reference to the latest btle revision
- Request publication shortly after Toronto

Chairs' Suggestion

- (unrelated to intended status):
Remove Appendix A: Non-normative, and
relies on an expired individual draft of how to represent
JSON with YANG

Questions

- Are there objections with draft-ietf-6lo-lowpan-mib being Proposed Standard?
- Are there objections to adding this caveat to the introduction or the removal of the appendix?

Cross-Layer Effort?

- COMAN (management of constrained devices) mailing list exists for some time, but no BoF
- Two drafts in WGLC in OPSAWG (until July 29!):
 - Management of Networks with Constrained Devices: Problem Statement and Requirements
<http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-opsawg-coman-probstate-reqs-02>
 - Management of Networks with Constrained Devices: Use Cases
<http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-opsawg-coman-use-cases-02>
- Management of constrained devices is related to multiple WGs (CORE, 6lo, 6TiSCH, “COMAN”, OPSAWG)
- Brian, Barry and Benoit promised to send out email to multiple WGs regarding a potential cross-layer effort to consider the problem space