

Differing MIB definitions

- IEEE 802 committees define their MIBs according to ISO 10165-x and IEEE 802.1f
- IETF defines their MIBs according to their own RFCs
- The two methods are not compatible
 - 802.1f defines a very flattened hierarchy
 - IETF RFCs 1155, 1212, 1213 define a much more flexible hierarchy
- This produces two entirely different sets of registrations

Informed Technology, Inc.

doc: IEEE 802.11 97/126

Problems in 802.11

- 802.11 attempted to provide a complete ASN.1 definition of the MIB as well as a classic GDMO-style definition.
 - These should have been equivalent
 - They were not
 - Not caught by reviewers in working group or LMSC ballots
- The GDMO was written in the 802.1f style, the ASN.1 in the IETF style.

Informed Technology, Inc.

doc: IEEE 802.11 97/126

What to do?

- 802 desires to produce widely (universally!) used standards
- Most managed networks use SNMP and IETF-style MIBs
- Writing the MIB definition is not a piece of cake
 - Content and definition of the MIB generate working group controversy and letter ballot comments (at least in 802.11)
- Should 802 continue to define MIBs in our standards?

Informed Technology, Inc.

doc: IEEE 802.11 97/126

Recommendation

- 802 should revise 802.1f to be compatible with the IETF RFCs
- 802 should continue to define its own MIBs, using the new, compatible format

Informed Technology, Inc.

doc: IEEE 802.11 97/126