

IETF 115 Session title

MANET November 2022

This session is being recorded

IETF 115 London
hosted by



Internet Engineering Task Force
© 2022 IETF Trust
Production by Meetecho



Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- [BCP 9](#) (Internet Standards Process)
- [BCP 25](#) (Working Group processes)
- [BCP 25](#) (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- [BCP 54](#) (Code of Conduct)
- [BCP 78](#) (Copyright)
- [BCP 79](#) (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

This session is being recorded

IETF 115 Meeting Tips

In-person participants

- Make sure to sign into the session using the Meetecho (usually the “Meetecho lite” client) from the Datatracker agenda
- Use Meetecho to join the mic queue
- *Keep audio and video off if not using the onsite version*
- **Wear masks unless actively speaking at the microphone.**



Remote participants

- Make sure your audio and video are off unless you are chairing or presenting during a session
- Use of a headset is strongly recommended

Resources for IETF 115 London

- Agenda
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/agenda>
- Meetecho and other information:
<https://www.ietf.org/how/meetings/115/preparation>
- If you need technical assistance, see the Reporting Issues page:
<http://www.ietf.org/how/meetings/issues/>

Resources for this session

Meetecho:

<https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/ietf115/?group=manet&short=&item=1>

Chat:

<https://zulip.ietf.org/#narrow/stream/manet>

Notepad (any volunteers?):

<https://notes.ietf.org/notes-ietf-115-manet>

Agenda

1. Chairs' Introduction (5 min)
 - Note Well, Agenda bashing
2. Internet-Draft status - chairs (10 min)
3. IETF-114 Joint Babel/ROLL/MANET session follow-up - chairs (10 min)
4. DTNMA Updates – Sarah Heiner (15 min)
5. Rechartering discussion - all (20 min)

Internet-Draft Status (1)

- Credit-based flow control I-D cluster: draft-ietf-manet-dlep-credit-flow-control, draft-ietf-manet-dlep-traffic-classification, draft-ietf-manet-dlep-da-credit-extension, draft-ietf-manet-dlep-ether-credit-extension.
- The first three of these are (still) under TSV-ART early review. David Black did a thorough job: 6 major and 12 minor issues flagged. Authors are resolving / dispelling these. Convergence is happening, but some issues are still open. (See next slide)
- draft-ietf-manet-dlep-ether-credit-extension needs to be added to the pack.
- Need to complete document shepherd write-ups, but...
- Next step: RTG-ART review?

Credit-based flow control open issues

- **Major - Number of documents: record in shepherd's write-up WG's decision (IETF113) not to merge documents as advised by David Black**
- Major - Flow match criteria: can there be multiple TIDs per destination?; if so, which one applies?
- Major – “Router MAY ignore flow control” if resource-constrained
- Major – Credit Window Initialization vs. in-flight traffic: motivate why this is not a problem
- Minor – Handling of unexpected / incongruous Data Items: insufficient to refer to general Data Item error handling described in RFC 8175?

Recap: Credit-based Flow Control I-Ds

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-credit-flow-control

- Credit Control Message
- Credit Control Response Message,
- Credit Window Initialization Data Item
- Credit Window Association Data Item
- Credit Window Grant Data Item
- Credit Window Status Data Item
- Credit Window Request Data Item

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-da-credit-extension

- DiffServ Aware Credit Window Extension Type

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-traffic-classification

- Traffic Classification Data Item
- DiffServ Traffic Classification Sub-Data Item
- Ethernet Traffic Classification Sub-Data Item

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-ether-credit-extension

- IEEE 802.1Q Aware Credit Window Extension Type

Proposal

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-credit-flow-control

- Credit Control Message
- Credit Control Response Message,
- Credit Window Initialization Data Item
- Credit Window Association Data Item
- Credit Window Grant Data Item
- Credit Window Status Data Item
- Credit Window Request Data Item

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-traffic-classification

- Traffic Classification Data Item
- DiffServ Traffic Classification Sub-Data Item
- Ethernet Traffic Classification Sub-Data Item

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-da-credit-extension

- DiffServe Aware Credit Window Extension Type

draft-ietf-manet-dlep-ether-credit-extension

- IEEE 802.1Q Aware Credit Window Extension Type

Internet-Draft Status (2)

- PHY-related DLEP Extensions – Individual I-Ds: draft-rogge-manet-dlep-radio-band, draft-rogge-manet-dlep-channel-utilization, draft-rogge-manet-dlep-radio-quality
- No progress since IETF-113
- WG adoption call for draft-rogge-manet-dlep-radio-band around IETF-113: some technical comments received, but no “support” / “do not support”
- Issue another adoption call for all three I-Ds?

IETF-114 Joint Babel/ROLL/MANET session follow-up

A few takeaways

- Some confusion among non-MANET participants around Duplicate Packet Detection. It is well understood that when sources originate identical packets, these should not be discarded. (RFC 6621, sec. 6)
- Data plane implementation aspects need to be addressed, but not necessarily by the IETF.
- The applicability of BIER to MANETs should be explored further. David Lamparter has begun work on a use cases / gap analysis draft for BIER over L2 multicast: [draft-lamparter-bier-manet-multicast-links-00](#)
- Multicast integration of MANETs with (wired) infrastructure networks should be possible.

Rechartering Discussion

- Current charter (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/manet/about/>): OLSRv2 maintenance, DLEP, DLEP flow control, DLEP traffic classification statistics (?), multicast protocol framework / multicast FIB, documenting challenges / best practices for deploying / managing MANETs
- Which items would we keep? Which items would we like to add?
- Some candidates: DTNMA for MANET, bitstring-based multicast, multicast interworking with external networks, ...
- Incorporate Babel?