“Outstanding” Issues in the marf–base draft

Murray S. Kucherawy
MARF Working Group
IETF 77
Outstanding Issues

• Short discussion of issues that attracted attention on the MARF mailing list during review

• Appear to have reached consensus on them already, so this is just review
Redaction Flag

• Issue: Some ARF message generators omit or change certain data to protect details of actual users
  – Sometimes this is mandated by the generator’s counsel
• Should there be a flag set on ARF messages in which there is some redacted data?
• Should it include some indication of which fields contain redacted information?
Redaction Flag

• Consensus appears to be not to do this
  – What could you do with that flag if it were set?
  – We don’t have it now and things seem to work just fine
  – Redacted data typically doesn’t include non-identifying things like Message-Id:, which can be used to find the offending message

• Text added to indicate that redaction is not advised, but acknowledges that it will happen
Reported-Domain:

- Issue: The syntax for this report field are well-defined, but the semantics (i.e. what domain goes here) are not
- So what is this really telling the ARF recipient?
- Shouldn’t the semantics be more formally defined by a standards track RFC?
- Is this redundant to Reported-URI:?
Reported-Domain:

• Consensus appears to be not to make any changes
  – Value of this field is advisory to the ARF recipient about how the report might be sorted
  – This isn’t formally specified now and things seem to work just fine
  – Knowing the selection of the data here is unspecified, the recipient can just choose to ignore it

• Text added to make it clear that the value’s selection is at the discretion of the ARF sender
Working Group Last Call

• WGLC on draft-ietf-marf-base to begin on April 2\textsuperscript{nd} and last for two weeks
  – Final chance to review that document before it gets sent to the IESG for publication