

DRIP Architecture WGLC Summary

Stuart Card, Adam Wiethuechter (AX Enterprize)

Robert Moskowitz (HTT Consulting)

Shuai Zhao (Editor, Tencent)

Andrei Gurtov (Linköping University)

Update summary

- Submitted 6 revisions since IETF 109 (change summaries were sent for each revision)
- WGLC: draft-ietf-drip-arch-11

Major Update Since IETF 109

- Address all editor's note
- More descriptive language in Section 1 Update FAA final rule
- Section re-organization:
 - consolidated HHIT related text to section 4 and 5.
 - Section 6 introduces Crowd sourced RID.
- Align with reqs-, replace “UAS Remote ID” with “DRIP entity identifier”
- Per authors' agreement, removed section 7 “DRIP transactions enabling trustworthy”
- Per AD's comment, updated informative wording in Section 4-6, where HHIT were used as an example of a DRIP Identifier.

Comments about what should arch- include...

- Comments are mostly concerning about Section 4, 5 and 6.
 - Section 4: “HHIT for DRIP Entity Identifier”
 - Section 5: “DRIP Identifier Registration and Registries”
 - Section 6: “Harvesting Broadcast Remote ID messages for UTM Inclusion”
- Daniel:
 - *“The way I see an architecture document is mostly exposing which boxes are involved and which box talks to which box. This includes the purpose of the communication as well as the protocol being used. I think a high level description could well fit in the architecture overview. The complex part is that here there are at least two main use cases, and many boxes - some more active than the others.”*
 - *“Currently we do have some additional description around RID, and the registries. I believe that is appropriated but I believe these sections could be clarified and simplified.”*

Comments about what should arch- include...(cont)

- Eric:
 - “Section 4, 5, and 6 are normative (they specify what to do) and it is really unusual in an architecture document (but there are exceptions). “
 - “Moreover, it uses the normative BCP14 uppercase words “MUST”, “SHOULD”, etc. that should only apply in a normative “protocol action” document and would also require a BCP 14 template.
- Stephane:
 - “I have the feeling that the draft is quite vague on many aspects, and it mixes architectural issues with details which are very interesting (such as the discussion about sizes of cryptographic keys and signatures) but may be not for an "architecture" document. Also, I'm glad there are rationales for some decisions (why HHIT and not HIT or CGA) but they should be more separated from the specification of the chosen architecture.”

Next Step

- We should decide:
 - If it is acceptable to include section 4 and 5.
 - Yes:
 - Only address existing comments from Daniel (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-drip/draft-ietf-drip-arch/pull/2/files>)
 - Remove specification details, only keep high-level descriptive language, leave details to solution draft ([draft-ietf-drip-rid](#)).
 - No:
 - Remove section 4 and 5 completely?
 - Section 6:
 - Comment from AD: belongs to solution space
 - Should we remove it to draft-moskowitz-drip-crowd-sourced-rid?
- Resolve remaining comments from Daniel along with the decision we agreed above
- Resolve remaining TLAs

Thanks