

**Discussion time**

# Items to discuss about scope (now, it is open mikes)

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

# Structure of the discussion

## 1. Open mike:

- Is the **approach** of splitting the work into 3 different fora right?
  - Focused new WG, existing WGs, wider RG
- What is the appropriate **overall scope**

## 2. Straw poll on the approach

## 3. If approach accepted, open mike: WG scope

## 4. Straw poll on WG energy level

# I. Is this approach right?

- An IRTF Research Group for understanding the larger problem space
- A focused new SEC area WG producing:
  - Guidelines on how to use existing protocols
  - Gap analysis of what needs to be modified
- New charter items on existing working groups
- Thoughts about overall scope

## 2. Questions

- Q1: Should the IETF do anything in this space?
- Q2: Should we form an IRTF RG?
- Q3: If yes, do we have enough of energy for RG?
- Q4: Are you willing to work to scope an IAB workshop in this area?
- Q5: Threat model

# Q1: Should the IETF spend energy on solving this problem?

- If you think that the IETF should attempt to identify and analyse the problems related to identifier unlinkability, , please hum
- If you think that the IETF should **not** spend energy on trying to identify and analyse the problems related to identifier unlinkability, please hum

# Q2: Should we form an IRTF RG?

- If you think we should propose an IRTF RG in this space, please hum
- If you think we should **not** propose a RG, please hum

# Q3/: Do we have enough of energy for an RG?

- If you are willing to work on an RG, and write documents, please raise your hand
- If you are willing to work towards a scope for an IAB workshop, please raise your hand