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Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- The IETF plenary session
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
Agenda Summary

Introduction: Tony Przygienda
Summary of charter, for context: Joel Halpern
Applicability statement: Juliusz Chroboczek
Required changes to Babel documents:
  Juliusz Chromoczek
Overview of some technical items: Tony Przygienda
Implementation issues: Toke Høiland-Jørgensen
Security considerations: Denis Ovsienko
Discussion of draft charter and interest in forming a working group:
Before We Start This BOF?

• What is it that one is attempting to achieve during the BOF?

[RFC5434]
This BOF is NOT a Barfight

So: keep your tempers, please. Be tough on problems and soft on people. That’s how work gets done.
This BoF is NOT for Comparisons and Marketing Claims
This BOF is NOT an Attempt to Kill Babel with Bureaucracy

- In IETF amount of documents / work items / requirements tends to be kept to “necessary and sufficient only” based on long-term scar tissue
This BoF is NOT to Show Off Coolest Hacks To Prove “It Works”

Yes, we are “Rough Consensus and Working Code” but on Proposed Standard the Consensus has to be tad less rough since the protocol will go into millions devices where a truck cannot be rolled easily
So, WHAT is This BoF for?

- See whether we agree on proposed charter and formation of a WG to fulfill it
- Gauge if there is enough interest to produce necessary PS track work and deploy Babel as a versatile new routing protocol (ideally in even wider scope than a “HomeNet routing protocol”)
- Discuss couple additional (technical and organizational) items to get reactions and measure interest
Proposed Charter Summary

The charter focuses on what is needed to move RFCs 6126 and RFC 7557, combined, to Proposed Standard

It also recognizes that we need to include security and manageability in such a move
Work Item Summary

- Produce a revision of RFC 6126 suitable PS
- Address security needs for BABEL.
- Produce an applicability statement as an informational RFC.
- Address manageability of Babel,
- May publish implementation experience
- May work on Multicast, probably later
- Coordinate with other working groups as need.