

# Draft-ietf-ecrit-lost-06

IETF 70



# Current status

- ✦ Just finished last call; in tracker state “Waiting for writeup”, but should probably transition to “Revised ID needed”.
- ✦ There were significant review comments from AD, IANA, Gen-ART reviewer, and other reviewers.
- ✦ At this point, expect no protocol changes as a result.



# Expected updates

- ✦ Fix Schema registration URI.
- ✦ Clarifying language on the Via header.
- ✦ Clarifying language on HTTP vs. ECRIT responses (e.g. redirects)
- ✦ Clarifying language in 5.6 on omitting the `<serviceBoundaryReference>` element in a response.
- ✦ Add `serviceName` to example.



# Quick questions

- ✦ Does Section 7's discussion of including multiple instances of location information need a forward reference to 8.3.1?
- ✦ Channel security is currently RECOMMENDED; AD cautions that security review may insist that it go to MUST. Do we want to add text justifying SHOULD?
- ✦ The draft says **"However, for an important class of services the appropriate specific service instance depends both on the identity of the service and the geographic location of the entity that needs to reach it."** should we add a reference to the URN draft (already passed by IESG)?