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Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>  Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 9:47 AM
To: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

Why not just have presentations from both prospective solutions in Atlanta
(LOADng and AODVv2) and let the WG decide between these options as a work
plan to address the reactive protocol requirement in MANET:
  1) Progress LOADng (which seems to be happening anyway)
  2) Progress AODVv2 (which seems to have stalled for 2+ years but now
     there are promises to pick that up)
  3) Merge AODVv2 and LOADng (which I think is impractical given e-mail
     reflector traffic....)

Not working on a reactive protocol seems like the least desirable outcome.
While there have been inputs for each possible path, it is unclear from
the reflector what the consensus of the group is.

Personally, it would be useful to hear in Atlanta about large scale
deployments (eg, working code) from each to help the WG decide. I think
all relevant technical information should be provided by Atlanta to help
the WG make the right decision.

Don

______________________________________________
manet mailing list
manet@ietf.org
https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/manet

Joseph Macker <jpmacker@gmail.com>  Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 10:02 AM
To: Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

Presentations will happen as your recommend.
Co-chair, WG, and AD are important elements to discuss this with..

-------
My private opinions may align with yours.
[Quoted text hidden]
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Abdussalam Baryun <abdussalambaryun@gmail.com>  Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 10:20 AM
To: Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>
I disagree with the present of LOADng, because it will need a full hour discussion and will waste time as it already did twice. I recommend its place to discuss SHOULD be first on the MANET list (as required by MANET Chair before but not followed).

However, I agree that the Chairs and AD are kindly recommended to organise the meeting and to make it efficient and progress mostly the WG works without other companies issues.

AB

[Quoted text hidden]
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Ulrich Herberg <ulrich@herberg.name> Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 10:38 AM
To: Abdussalam Baryun <abdussalambaryun@gmail.com>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

You don't have to participate in this discussion if you think it is such a waste of time. It would be much more productive if you actually read both drafts and give technical arguments for your opinion. Note that LOADng was only started after there was no activity on DYMO for 2.5 years. A half-hour discussion in the meeting seems not overly wasted time compared to that.

Ulrich
[Quoted text hidden]
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Abdussalam Baryun <abdussalambaryun@gmail.com> Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 10:46 AM
To: Ulrich Herberg <ulrich@herberg.name>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

I am participating in the meeting which is a two hour meeting, and I don't like to avoid this discussion, but like to avoid interrupts to WG progresses. Please note that my recommendation prefers to let LOADng discussions on the lists first (seems a suitable place/channel for such confusing issues), use our valuable f2f meeting time on IETF-WG works. However, agree that AD and Chairs will do the best practice.

AB
[Quoted text hidden]
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Jon Black <jblack.ietf@yahoo.com> Thu, Nov 1, 2012 at 10:47 AM
Reply-To: Jon Black <jblack.ietf@yahoo.com>
To: Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>, "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>
From: Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>
To: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2012 8:47 AM
Subject: [manet] Reactive Protocol - LOADng vs. AODVv2 at Atlanta

[Quoted text hidden]

Daniel He <drdanhe@gmail.com>
To: Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

Great suggestions! We need a comparison work of AODVv2 and LOADng.

--
Dan He

Tel: +44-788-686-3428

Mukul Goyal <mukul@uwm.edu>
To: Daniel He <drdanhe@gmail.com>
Cc: List <manet@ietf.org>

Those of us who wont be at Atlanta would greatly appreciate hearing from AODVv2/LOADng authors on the mailing list what they think are the similarities and the differences between the two protocols.

Thanks
Mukul

[Quoted text hidden]

Dearlove, Christopher (UK) <Chris.Dearlove@baesystems.com>
To: Daniel He <drdanhe@gmail.com>, Don Sturek <d.sturek@att.net>
Cc: "<manet@ietf.org> List" <manet@ietf.org>

There's a more succinct way of saying what I said in several more lines. (The second sentence.)

--
Christopher Dearlove
I am interested to see your efforts on a comparison, but we don't forget to mention that LOADng is developed from LOAD and AODV RFC3561,

AB
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