

RDAP Extension Identifiers



Tom Harrison (tomh@apnic.net)
IETF 121 REGEXT Working Group

What is this about?

- `draft-ietf-regext-rdap-rir-search-11`
 - Uses multiple extension identifiers
 - `rirSearch1`, `ips`, `autnums`, `ipSearchResults`,
`autnumSearchResults`
 - Relies on 'bare' paths
 - Adds new paths under existing paths (`/domains/...`)
- Some discussion on the list about compliance with existing documents
- Document shepherd suggested flagging at this meeting

Arguments Against

- Bare paths are not permitted, per RFC 9082:
 - “Custom path segments can be created by prefixing the segment with a unique identifier followed by an underscore character (0x5F)”
- Bare members in JSON are not recommended, per RFC 9083:
 - “Servers that insert such unspecified members into JSON responses SHOULD have member names prefixed with a short identifier followed by an underscore followed by a meaningful name”
- New paths under existing paths can make processing confusing

Arguments For

- IP and ASN are core types, and prioritising consistency with the other core types makes RDAP easier to use
- With path prefixes, users may infer that this extension has some control over the associated core object types, which could be problematic
- Approach approved implicitly by way of RFCs 9536 and 9537
- Bare paths unlikely to cause problems in practice