

# draft-ietf-lager-specification

Status Update — November 2015

Kim Davies <[kim.davies@icann.org](mailto:kim.davies@icann.org)>

# Current Status

- Version -04 (18 October)
  - Correct namespace in schema (migrated from URL to URN)
- Version -03 (21 September)
  - Clarify use of reflexive variants in checking label validity, added security considerations, discussion of conditions where duplicate labels may be generated, typos and other minor fixes.
- Version -01/-02 (1 September)
  - Implement most actions from the August 24 meeting.
- Thanks Asmus!

# Remaining Issues

- Origin URL (#2)
- Add Disposition Registry (#6, #22)
- Media Type Registration (#21)
- Metadata for reference LGRs
- Careful review of RelaxNG schema

## #2: Origin URL

- Suggestion was to have metadata of an “origin” URL where a client could automatically refresh the LGR from.
- No clear need that can’t be addressed in other ways, and no strong advocates for it. Notes from 24 August meeting don’t paint a clear consensus.
- Not essential for functioning of LGR spec.
- Suggest abandoning.

# #6 & #22: Create Disposition Registry

- Issue #6, whether to have a registry, was discussed during August meeting. Suggestion of namespacing private extensions, and require extensions to core dispositions need to be documented in an RFC.
- Suggest two types of dispositions:
  - Standard: four described, any additional must be specified in Standards Track RFC
  - Private: must take the form “entity:disposition”, open to FCFS usage.

# #6 & #22: Create Disposition Registry

## 10.3. Disposition Registry

This document establishes a vocabulary of "Label Generation Ruleset Dispositions" which should be reflected as a new IANA registry. This registry should be divided into two sub-registries:

- o **Standard Dispositions** - This registry shall list dispositions that have been defined in Standards Track documents. The initial set of registrations shall be the four dispositions in this document described in Section 6.3.
- o **Private Dispositions** - This registry shall list dispositions that have been registered on a first-come first-served basis by third parties with the IANA. Such dispositions must take the form "entity:disposition" where the entity is a prefix that uniquely identifies the private user of the namespace. For example, "acme:reserved" could be a private extension used by the organization ACME to denote a disposition relating to reserved labels. These extensions are not intended to be interoperable, but registration is designed to minimize potential conflicts. It is strongly recommended any new dispositions that require interoperability and have applicability beyond a single organization be defined as Standard Dispositions.

All private dispositions MUST be registered using the prefix-colon notation to distinguish them from standard dispositions.

The IANA registry should provide data on the name of the disposition, the intended purposes, and the registrant or defining specification for the disposition.

# #21: Media-Type Registration

- Document specifies “application/lgr+xml” as media type for the format.
- Allows clients to intelligently handle document if they have understanding of LGR format.
- RFC 7303 provides a process for registering XML-based media types, document needs the appropriate registration template as an IANA Consideration.

# Metadata for reference LGRs

- Some LGRs are developed without a specific context in mind (such as reference or model LGRs)
- How to represent the purpose in the metadata?
  - Current scope mechanism may be insufficient
- Some possible approaches:
  - `<scope type="domain">.example</scope>`
  - `<scope type="domain" />`
- Probably just need to have text explicitly addressing issue

# Careful review of RelaxNG schema

- Specification text may have slightly drifted from the schema
- Needs a careful review before finalization to ensure the schema correctly aligns with the accompanying text

# Next steps

- IANA Consideration text (covering media type, disposition registry) prepared for next draft.
  - Working text in <http://github.com/kjd/lgr-specification>
- Publish new -05 draft after this meeting, based on outcome of discussion
  - Is the namespacing mechanism OK?
  - How do we want to approach metadata for reference tables?
  - Fresh eyes to review schema?
- If no new issues identified after next draft, last call?