

CDNI URI Signing

(draft-leung-cdni-uri-signing-05)

CDNI Working Group
IETF 89 London, UK
Mar 6, 2014

Kent Leung (kleung@cisco.com)
Francois Le Faucheur (flefauch@cisco.com)
Bill Downey (william.s.downey@verizon.com)
Ray van Brandenburg (ray.vanbrandenburg@tno.nl)
Scott Leibrand (sleibrand@llnw.com)

Changes Since Last IETF

Key changes are:

- Updated the document to be in line with the new approach of mandatory packaging and encapsulated information elements.
- Only one attribute in the URI query string is used for URI Signing. The attribute name is provided by CDNI metadata.
- Adjusted section 2 to make a clear distinction between an information element (the three categories) and the packaging attribute.
- Fixed inconsistencies and errors in the document which addressed Kevin's comments

Key Issue Addressed

- The "URI Squatting" issue, as described in draft-ietf-appsawg-uri-get-off-my-lawn, was raised by Mark Nottingham. There was a consensus to use CDNI Metadata Interface to define the attribute name(s) in the URI query string as the resolution.
- Resolved with the following text:

5. Append the parameter name used to indicate the URI Signing Package Attribute, as communicated via the CDNI Metadata interface, followed by an "=". If none is communicated by the CDNI Metadata interface, it defaults to "URISigningPackage". For example, if the CDNI Metadata interface specifies "SIG", append the string "SIG=" to the message.

Request Routing Options

There are two options for RR Interface to support URI Signing:

1. uCDN sends request to dCDN, dCDN provides a Signed URI to uCDN
2. uCDN sends request to dCDN, dCDN provides the Surrogate's info to uCDN, uCDN signs the URI

Afterwards, uCDN sends the Signed URI to UA

Do people have preferences for either or vs. both?

Next Steps

- Fill in section for CDNI interfaces
- Adopt this draft as the base WG draft?