

# **CDNI Working Group (CDN Interconnect)**

# Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPS. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- [BCP 9](#) (Internet Standards Process)
- [BCP 25](#) (Working Group processes)
- [BCP 25](#) (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- [BCP 54](#) (Code of Conduct)
- [BCP 78](#) (Copyright)
- [BCP 79](#) (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

# Welcome to CDNI

- IETF-112 Online Meeting Chairs:
  - Kevin Ma
  - Sanjay Mishra
- One session
  - Tuesday, November 9, 2021, 16:00-18:00, Room 1
- Minute takers
- Jabber scribe
- Blue sheets

# Working Group

## Remaining Milestones

- CDNI Framework: Done (Informational) RFC7336
- CDNI Requirements : Done (Informational) RFC7337
- CDNI Logging interface : Done (PS) RFC7937
- CDNI Redirection interface: Done (PS) RFC7975
- CDNI Metadata interface: Done (PS) RFC8006
- CDNI Control interface (Triggers) : Done (PS) RFC8007
- CDNI Footprint & Capabilities Adv - Semantics: Done (PS) RFC8008
- CDNI Request Routing Extensions: Done (PS) RFC8804
- URI Signing for CDNI: Done (PS) ...?
- CDNI HTTPS Delegation: ? (PS)
- CDNI Control interface (Triggers) v2 : ? (PS)

# Agenda

- **Opening**
  - Agenda bashing & introduction: Chairs (5 min)
- **CDNI Triggers & CDNI Footprints**
  - Adoption: Chairs (5 min)
  - draft-sopher-cdni-triggers-extensions-rfc8007bis: Nir Sopher (10 min)
  - draft-sopher-cdni-footprint-types-extensions: Nir Sopher (10 min)
- **CDNI URI Signing**
  - draft-ietf-cdni-uri-signing: Phil Sorber (10 min)
- **HTTPS Delegation**
  - draft-ietf-cdni-interfaces-https-delegation: Frederic Fieau (20 min)
- **CDNI Metadata**
  - draft-goldstein-cdni-metadata-model-extensions: Glenn Goldstein (30 min)
- **Capacity Advertisement**
  - draft-ryan-cdni-capacity-insights-extensions: Andrew Ryan (20 min)
- **Closing**
  - Wrap up: Chairs (5 min)

# Adoption of draft-sopher-cdni-triggers-extensions-rfc8007bis

- draft-finkelman-cdni-triggers-sva-extensions was adopted after IETF 103
- We decided that trigger extensibility should have been in the original draft and the updates did not require rechartering; a milestone was added
- Earlier this year we decided that the triggers extension would be better (more clearly) specified as a revision of the triggers interface
- draft-sopher-cdni-triggers-extensions-rfc8007bis is the rewrite of draft-finkelman-cdni-triggers-sva-extensions as a triggers interface bis draft
- After IETF 111 we issued a call for (re)adoption on draft-finkelman-cdni-triggers-sva-extensions
- There were no objections on the list
- The chairs discussed adoption with our AD and there was no objection

## Questions from the Chairs:

- Last call for any objections to adoption?
- The existing milestone target is Dec 2021; should we extend the deadline?
- Is March 2022 a reasonable deadline?

# Adoption of draft-sopher-cdni-footprint-types-extensions

- draft-sopher-cdni-footprint-types-extensions proposes registration of two new footprint types in the CDNI Metadata Footprint Types registry
- The CDNI interfaces were designed to be extensible through the use of registries without needing to modify the interface specifications and without needing to recharter
- Registry additions require a specification which we welcome in the WG
- After IETF 111 we issued a call for adoption on draft-sopher-cdni-footprint-types-extensions
- There were no objections on the list
- The chairs discussed adoption with our AD and there was no objection

## Questions from the Chairs:

- Last call for any objections to adoption?
- Any object to adding a milestone for this draft?
- Is March 2022 a reasonable deadline?