

REGEXT Implementations Required

Andy Newton
IETF 120 - 22 July 2024

Background

- 2 independent implementations required to move from Proposed Standard to Full Standard.
- Generally, no implementations required to move from I-D to Proposed Standard.
 - But Working Groups and the IESG can require it depending on circumstances.
- MAILMAINT charter requires “commitment to implement”
- SIDROPS and IDR require 2 independent implementations with published implementation report.

The Proposal for REGEXT

“The basic proposal is to adopt the SIDROPS/IDR thresholds but with a lower bar for all RDAP extensions: before publication on the standards track there must be at least one interoperable server and client implementation documented with an implementation report published on the working group wiki [4].”

- Why RDAP and not EPP?
 - RDAP serves at least 3 distinct constituencies: gTLD, ccTLD, RIR.
 - Understanding another perspective is easier when there are implementations.
 - RDAP is where we have had recent specification surprises.
- EPP could be included.
 - The most recent EPP extension appears to meet this requirement.

Wiki vs Implementation Status Section of I-D

- The wiki is easier to update when the implementors are not the I-D authors.
- Implementation Status Section is removed from the final RFC.
 - So wiki is more “permanent”, easier to find.
- Using IDR as a go-by, implementation reports published on their wiki are much more thorough than an Implementation Status Section.
 - This should be our aim.
- Implementation Status Sections follow a document through the review process.
 - A hybrid approach might be to have an Implementation Status Section that points to the wiki.

What happens if there are not enough implementations?

- Allow to be published as Experimental, republish as PS once there are implementations.
 - This seems to fall into the guidelines for experimental [1]:
 - *“If the IETF may publish something based on this on the standards track once we know how well this one works, it's Experimental.”*
 - IETF retains change control.
 - Even an Experimental RFC means something.
- Both EPP and RDAP have open registries.
 - Neither require an IETF publication of any kind. Just has to be stable.

[1] <https://www.ietf.org/process/process/informational-vs-experimental/>

De-facto VETO

From George Michaelson:

“de-facto VETO from incumbency. I am concerned in other WG this is being used by what I can only call a “cabal” of friendship, to oppose things “the bad person” suggests could or should be done.”

- The intent is to raise the quality of REGEXT documents.
- If there is another dynamic at play, we need to discuss it.

Discuss