Homenet Working Group Internet-Draft Intended status: Informational Expires: May 21, 2016

Homenet Routing Consensus Call draft-ietf-homenet-routing-consensus-call-00

Abstract

In order to support arbitrary network topologies and multi-homing the IETF Homenet Architecture [RFC7368] requires that a routing protocol operates inside each home network. For interoperability reasons it is necessary for there be a single "mandatory to implement" routing protocol. With the Homenet Working Group unable to reach clear consensus on which protocol that should be the Working Group Chairs (with the support of the Internet Area Director) declared rough consensus that the chosen protocol is BABEL [RFC6126]. This document confirms this decision for the record.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 21, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to <u>BCP 78</u> and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents

Bellis & Townsley Expires May 21, 2016

[Page 1]

carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

<u>1</u> .	Statement										<u>2</u>
<u>2</u> .	IANA Considerations										<u>3</u>
<u>3</u> .	Security Considerations										<u>3</u>
<u>4</u> .	Acknowledgements										<u>3</u>
<u>5</u> .	Informative References										<u>3</u>
Autl	nors' Addresses										<u>3</u>

1. Statement

On the 27th of October, 2015, the Working Group Chairs and the Internet Area Director made the following statement to the Homenet Mailing List:

The Chairs believe that there is WG consensus that a single "mandatory to implement" routing protocol must be chosen. We also believe that further delaying the direction here has long passed the point of diminishing returns.

Based on the feedback received in Prague and on the WG mailing list thereafter, we are therefore declaring rough consensus that BABEL [<u>RFC6126</u>] shall be the "mandatory to implement" routing protocol for Homenet routers, albeit only on an Experimental basis at this time.

The aim in making this decision is to allow the non-routingprotocol aspects of Homenet to move forward in the near term, while allowing time for additional implementation, experimentation and specification. To that end, we solicit Experimental Internet Drafts to document Homenet-specific profiles of any applicable routing solution and to report results of any relevant experimentation and implementation.

We expect that this decision will be revisited in a future Standards Track document based on specifications and running code available at that time.

Vendors looking to ship Homenet routers in the near term should refer to [<u>RFC6126</u>], [<u>RFC7557</u>], [<u>I-D.boutier-babel-source-specific</u>], and available open source

[Page 2]

implementations thereof for the routing protocol portion of the Homenet solution space.

<u>2</u>. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA considerations.

<u>3</u>. Security Considerations

This document has no security considerations.

4. Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Terry Manderson (INT Area AD) for his support.

<u>5</u>. Informative References

- [RFC7368] Chown, T., Ed., Arkko, J., Brandt, A., Troan, O., and J. Weil, "IPv6 Home Networking Architecture Principles", <u>RFC</u> <u>7368</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC7368, October 2014, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7368>.
- [RFC6126] Chroboczek, J., "The Babel Routing Protocol", <u>RFC 6126</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC6126, April 2011, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6126</u>>.
- [RFC7557] Chroboczek, J., "Extension Mechanism for the Babel Routing Protocol", <u>RFC 7557</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC7557, May 2015, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7557</u>>.

[I-D.boutier-babel-source-specific] Boutier, M. and J. Chroboczek, "Source-Specific Routing in Babel", <u>draft-boutier-babel-source-specific-01</u> (work in progress), May 2015.

Authors' Addresses

Ray Bellis Internet Systems Consortium, Inc. 950 Charter Street Redwood City CA 94063 USA Phone: +1 640 423 1200

Email: ray@isc.org

Mark Townsley Cisco

Email: mark@townsley.net