

WEIRDS Extensibility and draft-design-team-weirds-using-http-01

Andy Newton

WEIRDS WG, IETF 84

1 August 2012

The Quizzical Olaf

- Should the “protocol” be versioned?
- Are there a set of core objects?
- Are there a set of standard extension objects?
- What about private extension objects?
- Can objects be extended?

“Protocol” Versioning

- Section 4.1
 - Done through media types
 - The ‘level’ parameter indicates version conformance.

Accept: applicaiton/weirds_blah+json;level=0

Content-Type: application/weirds_blah+json;level=0

- Should we drop the +json stuff?

Common Data Structures

- rdapConformance and notices (section 9)

```
"rdapConformance" : [  
  "nrrdap_level_0"  
]
```



Related to the media type.

```
"rdapConformance" : [  
  "nrrdap_level_0"  
  "lunarNic_objs_0"  
]
```

Basic Extensibility via Naming

6.2 Naming

Clients processing JSON [RFC4627] responses **SHOULD ignore values associated with unrecognized names.** Servers **MAY** insert values signified by names into the JSON responses which are not specified in this document. **Insertion of unspecified values into JSON responses SHOULD have names prefixed with a short identifier followed by an underscore followed by a meaningful name.**

```
{
  "handle" : "ABC123",
  "remarks" : [
    "she sells seas shells",
    "down by the seashore"
  ]
}
```

```
{
  "handle" : "ABC123",
  "\u0026lunarNic_beforeOneSmallStep" : "TRUE THAT!",
  "remarks" : [
    "she sells seas shells",
    "down by the seashore"
  ],
  "\u0026lunarNic_harshMistressNotes" : [
    "In space,",
    "nobody can hear you scream."
  ]
}
```

6.2 Naming

Clients processing JSON [RFC4627] responses **SHOULD** ignore values associated with **unrecognized names**. Servers **MAY** insert values signified by names into the JSON responses which are not specified in this document. **Insertion of unspecified values** into JSON responses **SHOULD** have names **prefixed with a short identifier** followed by an underscore followed by a meaningful name.

The same feature allows one specification to extend objects from another specification. That is, the "names" specifications could extend objects from the "numbers" specifications.

```
{
  "handle" : "ABC123",
  "remarks" : [
    "she sells seas shells",
    "down by the seashore"
  ]
}
```

```
{
  "handle" : "ABC123",
  "nameAuthority" : "ICANN",
  "remarks" : [
    "she sells seas shells",
    "down by the seashore"
  ],
  "disposition" : [
    "registry_locked",
    "registrar_locked"
  ]
}
```


Prefix Circus

```
"\tunarnic_harshMistressNotes" : [  
    "In space,",  
    "nobody can hear you scream."  
]
```

- Do we want a registry for the prefixes?
- If so, what type:
 - First Come First Served, Expert Review, Specification Required, RFC Required, IETF Review, Standards Action, IESG Approval
 - See RFC 5226
- EPP had none. IRIS required Standards Action.