

draft-ietf-geopriv-lis-discovery

IETF-73, Minneapolis

Before publication

- ▶ **Open issues**
 - ▶ Appropriate forgery protection
 - ▶ URI scheme
- ▶ **Need a few more people to review the document**



DNS forgery options

- ▶ **Three options:**
 - ▶ No protection
 - ▶ draft-ietf-dnsext-forgery-resilience (informative ref?)
 - ▶ DNSSEC (this isn't going to be implemented)
- ▶ **Proposal:**
 - ▶ Inform, then leave the choice relatively open
 - ▶ “An access network **SHOULD** provide forgery protection, which **MAY** include support for DNSSEC.”
 - ▶ No explicit mandate for hosts



URI scheme

- ▶ **Option: A held[s]: URI scheme to identify a URI as being for HELD (and LCP)**
 - ▶ Justification: some special behaviour is needed to avoid errors from middlebox involvement
 - ▶ Useful if no contextual information is assigned a URI
- ▶ **Author's proposal: http:/https: URIs only**
 - ▶ An LCP URI must be a product of discovery
 - ▶ Discovery process provides necessary context
 - ▶ Text to this effect in the current draft

