Evaluating our dots draft using hrpc considerations

Giovane C. M. Moura
SIDN Labs
giovane.moura@sidn.nl

IPv6 DOTS Signal Option
draft-francois-dots-ipv6-signal-option-00

Introduction

- Draft: `draft-francois-dots-ipv6-signal-option-00`
- Joint-draft with J. Francois, A. Lahmadi, and M. Davids
- Very first version (pros and cons)
- Myself: 4th IETF, academic background
- Our draft in one sentence:
  - *Defines a fall-back signaling mechanism for devices under a DDos Attack*
- Meaning: does not involve users directly $\rightarrow$ machine2machine communications

Evaluating our draft

- Relevant questions to our draft: :
  - 5.3.2.1.(1,2,3,4,6,7,8) , 14 (it's not dependable since it is fall-back opportunistic),16,17,19
- More less relevant:
  - 12 (there was a heated discussion on the language issue in Buenos Aires, and if I am not mistaken, one of the conclusions was that (i) is very hard to have it in protocol design and (ii) maybe we should start at the application layer first, since it is the layer that directly interact with the users) , 15 (we employ fields and data specified by another draft by other authors)
- Not directly related:
  - 5 (since its machine to machine signaling), 9 10 11,13, 18, (since it does not handle end-user data),20 (same reasons),

Lessons learned

1. Help IETFers in questioning their **implicit values** in the protocol design
   - I had a previous experience with Value Sensitive Design (VSD) on my phd thesis
   - Our paper on this analysis: `http://doc.utwente.nl/87095/`
2. It's a **great checklist** for IETFers
   - So you don't miss important RFCs
3. It's a **win-win**: consider hr in your draft and you'll have a better (technically as well) draft
   - this should help IETFers adopting it
4. What we're gonna change in our draft: isn't clear yet, the draft is in the early stages, big things to fix still
5. And of course, as expected, it takes time and effort