Definitions of Textual Conventions for Generalized Multiprotocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Management

draft-ietf-ccamp-gmpls-tc-mib-11.txt

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with Section 6 of BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html.

Abstract

This document defines a Management Information Base (MIB) module which contains Textual Conventions to represent commonly used Generalized Multiprotocol Label Switching (GMPLS) management information. The intent is that these TEXTUAL CONVENTIONS (TCs) will be imported and used in GMPLS related MIB modules that would otherwise define their own representations.
1. Introduction

This document defines a MIB module which contains Textual Conventions for Generalized Multiprotocol Label Switching (GMPLS) networks. These Textual Conventions should be imported by MIB modules which manage GMPLS networks.

This MIB module supplants the MIB module in [RFC3811] that defines Textual Conventions for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Management. [RFC3811] may continue to be used without this MIB module in networks that support only MPLS.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14, RFC 2119, reference [RFC2119].

For an introduction to the concepts of GMPLS, see [RFC3945].

2. The Internet-Standard Management Framework

For a detailed overview of the documents that describe the current Internet-Standard Management Framework, please refer to section 7 of RFC 3410 [RFC3410].

Managed objects are accessed via a virtual information store, termed the Management Information Base or MIB. MIB objects are generally accessed through the Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP). Objects in the MIB are defined using the mechanisms defined in the Structure of Management Information (SMI). This memo specifies a MIB module that is compliant to the SMIv2, which is described in STD 58, RFC 2578 [RFC2578], STD 58, RFC 2579 [RFC2579] and STD 58, RFC 2580 [RFC2580].
3. GMPLS Textual Conventions MIB Definitions

This MIB module makes references to the following documents:
[RFC2578], [RFC2579], and [RFC3811].

GMPLS-TC-STD-MIB DEFINITIONS ::= BEGIN

IMPORTS
  MODULE-IDENTITY
    FROM SNMPv2-SMI
    -- RFC2578
  TEXTUAL-CONVENTION
    FROM SNMPv2-TC
    -- RFC2579
  mplsStdMIB
    FROM MPLS-TC-STD-MIB
    -- RFC3811
;

gmplsTCStdMIB MODULE-IDENTITY
LAST-UPDATED
"200609060001Z" -- 06 September 2006 00:00:01 GMT
ORGANIZATION
"IETF Common Control And Measurement Plane (CCAMP) Working Group"
CONTACT-INFO
  "Thomas D. Nadeau
   Cisco Systems, Inc.
   Email: tnadeau@cisco.com"

  "Adrian Farrel
   Old Dog Consulting
   Email: adrian@olddog.co.uk"

Comments about this document should be emailed direct to the
CCAMP working group mailing list at ccamp@ops.ietf.org"
DESCRIPTION
"Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006). This version of
this MIB module is part of RFC XXX; see the RFC itself for
full legal notices.
-- RFC Editor. Please replace XXX above with the correct RFC number and
-- remove this note.

This MIB module defines TEXTUAL-CONVENTIONs for concepts used in
Generalized Multiprotocol Label Switching (GMPLS) networks."
REVISION
"200609060001Z" -- 06 September 2006 00:00:01 GMT
DESCRIPTION
"Initial version published as part of RFC XXX."
::= { mplsStdMIB YYY }
GmplsFreeformLabelTC ::= TEXTUAL-CONVENTION
   STATUS current
   DESCRIPTION
   "This Textual Convention can be used as the syntax of an object
   that contains any GMPLS label. Objects with this syntax can be
   used to represent labels that have label types that are not
defined in any RFCs. The freeform GMPLS Label may also be used
by systems that do not wish to represent labels that have
label types defined in RFCs using type-specific syntaxes."
   REFERENCE
   "1. Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling
   Functional Description, RFC 3471, section 3.2."
   SYNTAX OCTET STRING (SIZE (0..64))

GmplsLabelTypeTC ::= TEXTUAL-CONVENTION
   STATUS current
   DESCRIPTION
   "Determines the interpretation that should be applied to an
   object that encodes a label. The possible types are:

   gmplsMplsLabel(1) - The label is an MPLS packet, cell,
or frame label and is encoded as
described for the Textual
Convention MplsLabel defined in
RFC 3811.

   gmplsPortWavelengthLabel(2) - The label is a port or wavelength
label as defined in
RFC 3471.

   gmplsFreeformLabel(3) - The label is any form of label
encoded as an OCTET STRING using
the Textual Convention
GmplsFreeformLabel.

   gmplsSonetLabel(4) - The label is a SONET label as
defined in
RFC 3946.

   gmplsSdhLabel(5) - The label is an SDH label as
defined in
RFC 3946.

   gmplsWavebandLabel(6) - The label is a waveband label as
defined in
RFC 3471."
   REFERENCE
   "1. Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling
   Functional Description, RFC 3471, section 3.
2. Definition of Textual Conventions and for Multiprotocol Label
Switching (MPLS) Management, RFC 3811, section 3.
for Synchronous Optical Network (SONET) and Synchronous
Digital Hierarchy (SDH) Control, RFC 3946, section 3."
SYNTAX INTEGER {
    gmplsMplsLabel(1),
    gmplsPortWavelengthLabel(2),
    gmplsFreeformGeneralizedLabel(3),
    gmplsSonetLabel(4),
    gmplsSdhLabel(5),
    gmplsWavebandLabel(6)
}

GmplsSegmentDirectionTC ::= TEXTUAL-CONVENTION
STATUS      current
DESCRIPTION
"The direction of data flow on an LSP segment with respect to the head of the LSP.

Where an LSP is signaled using a conventional signaling protocol, the ‘head’ of the LSP is the source of the signaling (also known as the ingress) and the ‘tail’ is the destination (also known as the egress). For unidirectional LSPs, this usually matches the direction of flow of data.

For manually configured unidirectional LSPs the direction of the LSP segment matches the direction of flow of data. For manually configured bidirectional LSPs, an arbitrary decision must be made about which LER is the ‘head’.”

SYNTAX INTEGER {
    forward(1),   -- data flows from head-end of LSP toward tail-end
    reverse(2)    -- data flows from tail-end of LSP toward head-end
}

END

4. Security Considerations

This module does not define any management objects. Instead, it defines a set of textual conventions which may be used by other GMPLS MIB modules to define management objects.

Meaningful security considerations can only be written in the MIB modules that define management objects. Therefore, this document has no impact on the security of the Internet.
5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to root MIB objects in this MIB module under the mplsStdMIB subtree by assigning an OID to gmplsTCStdMIB.

Upon approval of this document, the IANA will make the following assignments in the "NETWORK MANAGEMENT PARAMETERS" registry located at http://www.iana.org/assignments/smi-numbers

In table ...mib-2.transmission.mplsStdMIB (1.3.6.1.2.1.10.166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decimal</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>GMPLS-TC-STD-MIB</td>
<td>[RFC-ccamp-gmpls-tc-mib]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- RFC Editor. Please replace YYY in the main text with the OID assigned by IANA and remove this note.

In the future, GMPLS related standards track MIB modules should be rooted under the mplsStdMIB (sic) subtree. IANA has been requested to manage that namespace in the SMI Numbers registry [RFC3811]. New assignments can only be made via a Standards Action as specified in [RFC2434].
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