

Discovery for BRSKI

draft-ietf-anima-brski-discovery-11
IETF125 Shenzhen
(was -09 at IETF124)

Toerless Eckert, Futurewei USA (tte@cs.fau.de)

Esko Dijk (esko.dijk@iotconsultancy.nl)

03/19/2026

Summary – changes since -09

- Review by Stuart Cheshire (mDNS, DNS-SD RFCs author)
- claude.ai english fixup run (nice! – needed to be reminded of rfc2119 and “perpass”)
- Added intro text introducing/expanding BRSKI terms
- 3.5.1.1 describing details of what to support for DNS-SD “signaling” (finding server)
 - Text was seemingly confusing in giving example of how limited/bad implementation could fail to interoperate. Toerless/Stuart divergence
 - Stuart: Good client implementations, widely tested on “user devices” – with user interface
 - Toerless: Worried about one-off implementations by various DNS-SD inexperienced vendors
 - Not all parts of finding/selecting DNS-SD server necessarily well in e.g.: avahi
 - SHOULD ... mDNS, unicast-DNS, SRP, DNS-SD Section 11 (discovery of browsing)
 - Hand waiving for DHCP options...
 - Additional paragraph about potential to do less – or need to do additional stuff for new type of interfaces such as in mesh-networks that choose different DNS-SD signaling procedures./

Summary – changes since -09

- 3.5.1.2 “well meaning is not well doing”
 - Wrong description how TXT strings in DNS-SD are encoded, removed (well specified in standard RFC for DNS-SD RFC6763)
 - MAYOR:
 - Current encoding had each variation string be a binary TXT key.
 - Most compact and simple to parse encoding
 - But it did overlook/ignore the “SHOULD be no more than 9 characters” of RFC6763
 - Stuart explained that pre-existing DNS-SD libraries could therefore easily have e.g.: max-9-character elements to hold TXT keys.
 - Therefore changed encoding: “var=variation1,variation2,...” - “var” is key for “variations”, value is comma separated list of variation strings
- Open issue:
 - Three tables still exceeding 72 characters. Even as RFC (long draft names replaced by RFC) this will not suffice.
 - I would hate having to make the draft unreadable by replacing IMHO “perfectly good tables” with some stupid alternative.
 - Thinking of converting tables to bitmap and then SVG - “to beat the stupid constraints”.
 - Any better ideas ?

Next Steps

- Will ask co-chair for Directorate early review
- Then WGLC
- Hopefully through before IETF126

Questions ?

- Thank you!