

# Are there design goals for Path Aware Networking?

Spencer Dawkins

If someone proposes "My Great PAN Approach"...

*... how do we know it's a **good** approach?*

Maybe we should have ... design goals?

*Define "beautiful baby" before the babies arrive*



# Do we already have design goals for PANRG?

- We learned a lot in [draft-irtf-panrg-what-not-to-do](#)
  - See [Section 2](#) and [Section 3](#)
- We didn't have many filters for adding contributions to [Section 5](#)
  - Contributions date back to the 1970s. Some goals have been dumped
- That entire draft was backward-facing. What about the future?
  - Privacy wasn't an impediment to deployment, but it's likely a design goal
  - What else would be new?
- We've been asked, repeatedly, for a document on "what **TO** do"
  - ISTM that agreeing on design goals would help us provide that

# Were there design goals for Scalable Routing?

- The Routing Research Group thought so - [RFC 6227](#)
  - "consists of a prioritized list of design goals for the target architecture."
- Started with architectural principles from the past - [RFC 1958](#)
- Set out design goals for the future
  - Improved Routing Scalability, Scalable Support for Traffic Engineering, Scalable Support for Multi-Homing, Decoupling Location and Identification, Scalable Support for Mobility, Simplified Renumbering, Modularity, Composability, and Seamlessness, Routing Quality, Routing Security, Deployability
- Provides a summary of the design goals

# Is Something like RFC 6227 a good model?

- ISTM that agreeing on what we're trying to accomplish would help us
  - We won't all have all of the same goals, and no other goals
  - (This is different from RRG - there's only one Internet, but lots of PANs)
- ISTM that we could continue this conversation on the mailing list
  - But we're all here together now, so we can talk

# Please Discuss