

# WEIRDS BoF

IETF 82

Taipei, Taiwan

# Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an “IETF Contribution”. Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- the IETF plenary session,
- any IETF working group or portion thereof,
- the IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
- the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
- any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
- the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 3978 and RFC 3979. Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 3978 for details.

# Proposed Charter

[http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/weirds/  
current/msg00231.html](http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/weirds/current/msg00231.html)

# Plan for meeting

1. Some review of the background
2. Short presentations on what people actually built
3. Short overview of requirements draft and issues in proposed charter
4. Discussion of (3) with focus on some questions to be answered today

# CRISP incorporated by reference

- Listed but not in detail
- What parts should be in and out?

Discussion today

# Specific client goals

## SHOULD

- Non-ASCII data
- Client-side caches
- Referrals and redirects

## MUST

- Generic data format (candidates XML & JSON)

# Specific server goals

## SHOULD

- Differential class of service

## MUST

- Internationalized data
- Referrals
- Standard data format
- Minimal baseline data set

# 3 Priorities in proposed charter

1. Complete internationalization
2. Machine-friendly data model & representation
3. Differential service levels



# Questions to get answered today

1. Is there a problem to be solved?
2. Is the problem statement clear enough?
3. Should this build more on IRIS? Why or why not?
4. Is there reasonable prospect for deployment?
5. Is one protocol for “registry data” the right approach?
6. Do we have volunteers?