

ALIEN BoF

Anonymous Identifiers

Wed, Aug 3rd, 2005

63rd IETF, Paris, France

Co-chairs: James Kempf and Pekka Nikander

Agenda (for bashing)

14:05	Goals and purpose of the BoF	Chairs
14:10	Terminology	Erik Nordmark
14:20	Scope of planned work	Chairs
14:30	One example approach	Pekka Nikander
14:50	Another example approach	Gab Montenegro
15:05	Tradeoffs between anonymity and identifiability	Bob Hinden
15:20	Lower layers threat model	Wassim Haddad
15:35	Lower layers problem stmt	Erik Nordmark
15:45	Open discussion	All

BoF topic

- Currently easy to correlate MAC, IP, TCP etc identifiers to track users in the Internet
 - a potential threat to privacy
- Legislation (in Europe) regulating how much information can be inadvertently disclosed
- What to do about this (if anything) and where?

Goals of the BoF

1. Consider forming a Research Group
 - Understanding the larger problem space
2. Consider forming a Working Group
 - Focus on **implementation guidelines**
3. Consider new working items for existing WGs
 - If it becomes apparent that **existing protocols** would benefit from **modifications**

Proposed scope for the planned work

- General perspective
- WG perspective
- RG perspective
- Scope issues to discuss (during open mike)
- Summary of proposed scope (to keep in mind)

In/out: General perspective

- Out
 - Onion routing
 - Anonymising services / forwarding
 - Hiding of real, topologically correct address
- In
 - Unlinkability of identifiers
 - Anonymous and pseudonymous identifiers

WG perspective

- Proposed new WG
 - How do you use existing protocols, without modifications, to implement unlinkability
 - In other words, **implementation guidelines**
 - Also **gap analysis**; what is missing/”wrong”
- Existing WGs
 - Modifications to existing protocols, if needed

RG perspective

- Wider than WG perspective
 - More open; no clear scope proposal yet
- Goal: Understanding the privacy problem
 - Throughout the stack, all layers
- Question (for chartering discussion, later):
 - Should onion-routing-like privacy issues be also considered in the RG scope?

Items to discuss about scope (not now, during open mikes)

- How to deal with the MAC layer part of the problem?
- Impact on other working groups
- How wide the scope of the potential RG should be?

Scope summary

- Focus: Unlinkability of identifiers
- New WG: implementation guides & gap analysis
- Existing WGs: Protocol work if needed
- Proposed RG: Wider understanding