Rfc5661bis Effort

Document Status and Next Steps

David Noveck
November 4, 2023
For IETF118 (Prague)

Overview Slide One of Two

- Work is proceding, albeit slowly:
 - Need to co-ordinate changes to multiple documents.
 - Limited time to work on these
- New drafts of major documents expected in next month:
 - <u>Security</u> will be first.
 - Will follow up with next draft of <u>rfc5661bis</u>.
 - Expect a major revision of <u>internationalization</u> to respond to external reviews.

Overview Slide Two of Two

- Major issues:
 - Stalled adoption process for security.
 - Lack of discussion of existing drafts Need to figure out how to address
- For details, see <u>Next Slide</u> which summarizes the documents in this effort and links to further details.

Document Status Summary

Document	Summary	Status	Next Steps
Rfc5661bis	Adopted but further discussion needed	Slide 5	Slides 6-7
Internationalization	Adopted and now dealing with external reviews.	Slides 8-10	Slides 11-12
Security	Adoption Process Sidetracked. Need to rectify.	Slides 13-16	Slide 17-18
rfc5662bis	Small set of changes. Should submit soon.	Slide 19	Slide 20

Rfc5661bis What's in Current Draft (-01)

- Adaptation to multi-document structure, explicitly referring to:
 - RFC8178 for extension issues
 - Internationalization addressing all minor versions together.
 - Security addressing security for all minor versions together
- Most errata reports for RFCs 5661 and 8881 addressed.
 - Some "rejected" ones addressed.
 - Only five left to address.

Rfc5661bis Expected in -02

- Address remaining errata reports.
- Reorganization of treatment of attributes
 - Will be co-ordinated with corresponding changes in <u>security</u>. For details, see <u>Security</u> -- <u>Attribute Classification Changes in -07</u>.

Rfc5661bis Expected next steps

- Submit -02.
- Need more focused discussion of contents.
 - Mostly on mailing list.
 - May need some interim meetings.
 - Need to ensure that all top-level sections are reviewed.

Internationalization Document status

Motivation:

- Treatment of subject of RFCs 5661 and 8881 do not correspond to implementations.
- Need a common description for all minor versions since all minor versions take the same approach.
 - Should follow the description in RFC7530.
- Included in current version:
 - Basic rewrite to match RFC7530.
 - Work to adapt to recent IDNA changes.

Internationalization External Review Results (Slide One of Two)

- Early internationalization review by N. Williams:
 - "On the right track" but really wanted me to write a completely different document. Didn't do that.
 - Had helpful suggestions regarding client name caching in the presence of case-insensitivity and normalization-related processing.
 - Incorporated those in -06, together with discussion of case-insensitive (and representation-independent) name mapping.

Internationalization External Review Results (Slide Two of Two)

- Extensive review by J. Klensin
 - Read the document but not closely.
 - Many concerns raised were not relevant to this document.
 - Raised some genuine issues regarding non-opacity of character mapping for LOOKUP
 - Will need to address in -07.
 - Suggested dropping new material regarding case-insensitivity etc.
 - Leaves us with a decision to make. See <u>Next Slide</u> for Details.
- Official ARTART review by A. Gulbrandson
 - "Almost ready" ☺
 - Included a number of easily dealt with suggestions for clarification

Internationalization Proposed Next Steps

- Submit -07 as soon as I can:
 - Will include A. Gulbrandson's suggestions and addressing J. Klensin's issue regarding LOOKUP.
 - Might include other J. Klensin suggestions, depending on the decision discussed in Next Slide.

Internationalization Decision to be Made

- Whether to take J. Klensin's advice re new material.
- Pro:
 - Will simplify the document and possibly the approval process.
- Con:
 - Leaves treatment of case-insensitive fs's in an unsatisfactory state.
 - Was a bad idea to include them but it is too late to remove them now.
 - Would need a follow-up document later.
- Need to discuss, most likely in an interim meeting.
 - Should schedule after next <u>security</u> draft is done.

Security Document Overview

- Original Motivation laid out in <u>Next Slide</u>.
- Further motivations/work discovered later:
 - Description of ACLs leaves too much unspecified.
 - Misuse and confusing uses of **SHOULD** that amount to **MAY**.
- Document status:
 - Adoption process started but never finished.
 - Need to rectify

Security Original Motivation

- Lack of threat analyses in all NFSv4 specifications.
- Existing treatment of AUTH_SYS ("OPTIONAL" means of "authentication")
 - OPTIONAL suggests clients free to use without negative consequences
 - It does no authentication.
 - Does not discuss unfortunate security consequences.
- Need to include connection-oriented security features rather than relying only on encryption provided by auth flavors.

Security Relevant Drafts

- Draft-dnoveck-nfsv4-security-06
 - Latest official draft (published 7/29/23)
 - Adoption call started soon thereafter but never completed
 - No longer relevant
- Draft-dnoveck-nfsv4-security-07
 - Expected in 1-2 weeks
 - Will request adoption
 - Re-organizes treatment of security-related attributes
 - Changes to attribute classification (See <u>Next Slide</u> for details)

Security Attribute Classification Changes in -07

- Issue raised in discussion of rfc5661bis.
 - Mode, Owner, Group_Owner need to be specified as "REQUIRED", rather than "RECOMMENDED", meaning OPTIONAL.
 - Will be addressed in next draft of <u>rfc5661bis</u>.
 - However, most of the work to address issue belongs in <u>security</u> and will be in -07
 - Designation of certain Attributes as "Experimental" since there is not sufficient information to create interoprable implementations:
 - Details to be discussed as Consensus Item #58 (see Appendix B)

Security Next Steps

- Get -07 out.
- Restart adoption process based on 07.
- Begin process of discussion of issues as described in <u>Next</u> Slide.

Security Issues to be discussed

- Issues are summarized In Appendix A.
 - Table points to where related text appears.
- We will need to focus discussion on specific sets of issues, as the work proceeds.
- Most discussion will be on the mailing list, but interims might be necessary.
- When consensus achieved, new drafts will reflect our decisions:
 - Vestigial text and author asides will be removed.
 - Replacement text will cease being conditional.

Rfc5662bis Document Status

- Small set of changes.
 - Many suggested by errata for other documents.
- Document not yet submitted ☺
 - Will fix in the next few days

Rfc5662bis Further Steps

- Once submitted, will discuss on mailing list.
- Expect adoption call fairly soon.