“Outstanding” Issues in the marf–base draft

Murray S. Kucherawy

MARF Working Group

IETF 77

Outstanding Issues

- Short discussion of issues that attracted attention on the MARF mailing list during review
- Appear to have reached consensus on them already, so this is just review

Redaction Flag

- Issue: Some ARF message generators omit or change certain data to protect details of actual users
  - Sometimes this is mandated by the generator's counsel
- Should there be a flag set on ARF messages in which there is some redacted data?
- Should it include some indication of which fields contain redacted information?

Redaction Flag

- Consensus appears to be not to do this
  - What could you do with that flag if it were set?
  - We don't have it now and things seem to work just fine
  - Redacted data typically doesn't include non-identifying things like Message-Id:, which can be used to find the offending message
- Text added to indicate that redaction is not advised, but acknowledges that it will happen

Reported-Domain:

- Issue: The syntax for this report field are well-defined, but the semantics (i.e. what domain goes here) are not
- So what is this really telling the ARF recipient?
- Shouldn’t the semantics be more formally defined by a standards track RFC?
- Is this redundant to Reported-URI:?

Reported-Domain:

- Consensus appears to be not to make any changes
  - Value of this field is advisory to the ARF recipient about how the report might be sorted
  - This isn't formally specified now and things seem to work just fine
  - Knowing the selection of the data here is unspecified, the recipient can just choose to ignore it
- Text added to make it clear that the value's selection is at the discretion of the ARF sender

Working Group Last Call

- WGLC on draft-ietf-marf-base to begin on April 2nd and last for two weeks
  - Final chance to review that document before it gets sent to the IESG for publication