

The IETF Operations and Network Management Area is pleased to respond to ETSI E2NA regarding your liaison of 21 Oct. 2013 on HOST ID standardization.

It is our understanding that ETSI E2NA is considering proposals based on one or more of the methods described in draft-ietf-intarea-nat-reveal-analysis-10, a document which is now published as RFC 6967. [1]

RFC 6967 is a survey of possible methods, published as informational RFC and not a Proposed Standard or Internet Standard. It reflects a consensus view of some feasible methods (with varying limitations) for conveying a host identifier.

At this time, there is no contemporaneous or subsequent RFC which represents consensus on which methods with respect to RFC 6967 are most appropriate. The IETF hip working-group has since 2004 been working on one of the methods included in the survey (Host Identity Protocol, published RFC 5201 an experimental RFC). [2]

The ETSI E2NA liaison makes two requests:

1. The IETF OPS area to confirm that the HOST ID approach is suitable for the M/493 use case.
2. The IETF OPS area to provide information on their work plan and milestones for further developing the HOST ID solution.

With respect to the first question, at this time, we do not have a consensus position with regard to preference for an RFC 6967 method.

Regarding the second question, there is no working-group chartered in the Operations and Management or Internet areas to address this question. Formal, working-group forming BOF (Birds of a Feather) sessions have been held or proposed in the INT (Internet) and OPS areas (Operations and Management) which did not result in chartered activity. The IETF ecrit working group in the RAI area is chartered to address resolution of caller location in an emergency context [3]. The ecrit working group is not however tasked with the the problem of host identity in this context.

It is our hope that we have been able to clarify the the current status of RFC 6967 and the status of work on host identity solutions in the IETF Operations and Management Area and elsewhere in the IETF.

Regards
Joel Jaeggli

[1] - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6967>

[2] - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc5201>
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/hip/charter/>

[3] - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/ecrit/charter/>