

# **ICN BOF Discussion**

ICNRG @ IETF-96

Börje Ohlman

Dave Oran

Dirk Kutscher

# ICN WG BOF Discussion

- There seems to be interest to move ICN closer to deployment
- There was a proposal for an ICN WG BOF for IETF-96
  - Not approved, several reasons
  - Questions on maturity, scope, level of consensus, security, IPR concerns, etc.
- This meeting today:
  - Discuss about the goal and possible next steps
  - Clarification: this is a general community discussion – not an ICNRG activity
  - But we want to facilitate it by sponsoring the time time slot

# Level of Consensus

- So far, we have been working with the CCNx specs as RG documents
  - ICNRG ownership of change control
  - Technical discussion in phone meetings between ICNRG meetings
  - Not excluding additional proposals for protocol specs
    - but there have not been contributions so far
- Concern: Not a healthy signal for ICN if we keep developing two different, incompatible sets of specs (CCNx and NDN)
- Idea: Start collaborative effort to overcome this

# Convergence Effort

- CCNx and NDN teams had first discussions
- Proposal for moving on:
  - Understand and document current differences
    - Not only syntax and mechanisms – also semantics and motivation for design decisions
  - Try to resolve differences – goals:
    - One set of specifications
    - Sufficient evolvability for new ideas in the future
- Intended outcome
  - Set of (Experimental) RFCs that represent community consensus on one combined NDN/CCNx design
  - Basis for more experiments and potentially deployment in selected scenarios

# Thoughts on the Process

- Documenting differences would be a good ICNRG activity
  - Could kick-off a focused team that frequently reports to and collects feedback from ICNRG
- Specification effort – two options:
  - Done in ICNRG as analysis of differences becomes solid
  - Propose WG BOF on this
    - Should be based on a good understanding of scope, applicability