

WEIRDS BoF (take two)

Murray S. Kucherawy

<msk@cloudmark.com>

Andrew Sullivan

<ajs@anvilwalrusden.com>

Note Well

- Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:
 - The IETF plenary session
 - The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
 - Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
 - Any IETF working group or portion thereof
 - Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
 - The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
 - The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function
- All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of [RFC 5378](#) and [RFC 3979](#) (updated by [RFC 4879](#)).
- Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.
- Please consult [RFC 5378](#) and [RFC 3979](#) for details.
- A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.
- A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

The story so far

- WHOIS isn't good enough anymore
 - No internationalization
 - No decent class-of-service capability
 - No reply format standards
 - No robust infrastructure
- This isn't new, but the problem has remained for a very long time
 - People want a change, but it hasn't happened

The story so far

- We took a run at dealing with this in the CRISP working group
 - Produced the IRIS requirements (RFC3707) and protocol suite
 - Has seen very sparse adoption due to perceived complexity, and political and technical inertia
 - So the problem is still here

The story so far

- ARIN and RIPE NCC took a run at doing something different
 - Deliver content over RESTful web services
 - Payload can be provided in text, HTML, XML or JSON
 - Can support UTF-8
- Benefits from the numerous advantages of the web infrastructure we have today
 - Open source, robust, extensible, authentication

The story so far

- Other RIRs (almost all of them) deployed their own prototypes based the proposed RIR drafts
- So we're almost done!
- OK, not really. What about names? They have the same problem, right?

Taipei BoF

- Demonstrations from RIRs
- Skepticism from the floor
 - If we build it, who will come?
 - Why will this succeed where CRISP did not?
 - ICANN doesn't require name registrars or registries to use this, and there was doubt they would
 - Name registries and registrars have little incentive to provide this service, and it's not quite free
 - Privacy considerations
- Consensus appeared to be to do number registries first, then names

Since Taipei

- Several big name registrars have stepped forward to participate
- Displeasure with the “numbers first” posture of the draft charter
- Given the names momentum we’ve seen since Taipei, charter revised to bring them back to being on-par
- ...so that’s what we’re here to discuss

Questions

- Is there still consensus that there's a problem to be solved?
- Is there still consensus that we have stated the problem clearly and correctly?
- Given the number and size of the name registries that have signed up to help work on the protocol, are people still concerned about the ordering?
- Are there any unaddressed concerns with the charter?

Proposed Charters

<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/weirds/current/msg00476.html>

(Summary of proposals)

<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/weirds/current/msg00833.html>

(Andy Newton's very latest)

Specific Charter Considerations

- Whether DNS names are included in the charter as possibly on-topic
- Whether DNS names have milestones for them (are they in-scope)
- The level of complication to be tolerated
- The comprehensiveness of the resulting protocol
- The degree to which the resulting protocol is extensible

Work Items

- With the remaining time available:
 - Any comments on the open documents?
 - draft-kucherawy-weirds-requirements
 - draft-newton-et-al-weirds-rir-json-response
 - draft-newton-et-al-weirds-rir-query
 - draft-sheng-weirds-icann-rws-dnrd
 - XML, JSON, something else?
 - Authentication methods?
 - Other topics?