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(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)
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.