

CDNI Control Interface / Triggers - 2nd Edition (RFC 8007bis) IETF 118

Sanjay Mishra/Nir Sopher

Prague, November 7th 2023

RFC 8007bis v9: What changed from v8?

- **Published v09 on July 30th 2023**

- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-cdni-ci-triggers-rfc8007bis-09>

- **What changed?**

- **Comments from IANA review (IETF117/IANA email from July 22, 2023)**

- Sec 6.2.6.1 Error Code: v8 erroneously referenced to add Registry entry to be added in RFC8007. IANA reviewer commented on this to define registries in the new RFC,
 - ie changed Registration from “[RFC8007]” to “RFCthis”
- Changed sections 11.2 through 11.7 from
 - **FROM:** “The IANA is requested to create a new “CDNI CI/T Trigger Specs” **subregistry** in the “Content Delivery Networks Interconnection (CDNI)” Parameters” **registry**.”
 - **TO:** “The IANA is requested to create a new “CDNI CI/T Trigger Specs” **registry** in the “Content Delivery Networks Interconnection (CDNI)” Parameters” **registry group**”

- **Nits throughout the document**

- **A diff from the v8 is available at:**

- <https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff?url2=draft-ietf-cdni-ci-triggers-rfc8007bis-09>

IANA comments on v9: Issue #1

- The IANA Considerations section consists of instructions to IANA, but statements concerning **definitions being repeated** don't seem to be written with IANA in mind, and are a little hard to parse for our purposes (specifically, finding out how many current references to RFC 8007 should be replaced).[sec 11.2 of v9]
- Section 11.2, para 3 in V9 currently says:
 - *Furthermore, this document, and specifically Section 3.1, repeats the definitions of the trigger types from [RFC8007] as trigger actions, and provide their specifications, with no modification comparing to [RFC8007].*
 - We need to delineate 1) what is required of IANA with 2)text that is only pertinent for the document and is not ambiguous. For example, the current language saying “definitions being repeated” can be made clear such as that “Section 3.1 reuses definition of “trigger types” as defined in [RFC8007]...”

IANA comments on v9: Issue #2

- “because all of the other registrations from that document are called out, the omission of the Payload Types registered by RFC 8007 suggests that their references should not be updated. It's not clear whether this was intended. We'd like to request that the document clearly state, possibly before Section 11.1, that (for example) **“All references to RFC 8007 in the IANA registries should be replaced with references to this document”** or **“All references to RFC 8007 in the IANA registries should be replaced with references to this document, apart from references associated with the following registrations:”**
 - Any preference which option to pick from above two options?

IANA comments on v9: Issue #3

- Section 11.2 and 11.7 refer to "subregistries" being created under "registries" rather than "registries" being created in "registry groups." While those terms were used in RFC 8007, it seems confusing to use both superseded and current terms for the same objects in adjacent subsections.
 - Will change to registries being created in registry groups.

What's outstanding?

- Align with Alan RE changes he has proposed (email thread in the mailing list)
 - Work with Nir and Alan to reach consensus on what additional changes can be added to Ci/T v2 versus a new document
- Kevin's comments on v9
- Fix nits/edits throughout the document

Next steps

Submit a near-final draft with all outstanding issues addressed and ask for a review towards WGLC