URI Signing for HAS content

draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has-02

CDNI

IETF 95

Buenos Aires

Ray van Brandenburg

TNO

What happened before

- URI Signing as specified in draft-ietf-cdni-uri-signing does not natively work for segmented content (e.g. HLS, DASH, etc.)
  - Main issue: With manifest-based content with relative URLs, each request is independent, with no redirection between CSP and CDN
- In order to solve this, work started on an extension to allow for chaining of tokens between subsequent segment requests
- Work was merged into draft-ietf-cdni-uri-signing-04
- During Dallas meeting, WG decided to remove segmented content extensions from the WG draft due to incoming KPN IPR statement (possible royalty or fee)
  - Removed sections re-published as draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has

Recent developments

- MPEG remains interested in a solution that is compatible with CDNI URI Signing
  - Latest liaison (March 8) at https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/1464/
  - MPEG will most likely come up with its own solution for URI Signing in case of no IETF solution
- Several new versions of draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has in the meantime
- Most importantly: Had long discussions with KPN trying to convince them to re-consider IPR terms

Proposed new IPR terms

If technology in this document is included in a standard adopted by IETF and any claims of any Koninklijke KPN N.V. patents are necessary for practicing the standard, any party will have the right to use any such patent claims under reasonable, non-discriminatory terms, with reciprocity, to implement and fully comply with the standard.

The reasonable non-discriminatory terms are:

If this standard is adopted, Koninklijke KPN N.V. will not assert any patents owned or controlled by Koninklijke KPN N.V. against any party for making, using, selling, importing or offering for sale a server or other CDN product implementation of the standard, provided, however that Koninklijke KPN N.V. retains the right to assert its patents (including the right to claim past royalties) against any party that asserts a patent it owns or controls (either directly or indirectly) against Koninklijke KPN N.V. or any of Koninklijke KPN N.V. affiliates or successors in title or against any products of Koninklijke KPN N.V. or any products of any of Koninklijke KPN N.V. affiliates either alone or in combination with other products; and Koninklijke KPN N.V. retains the right to assert its patents against any product or portion thereof that is not necessary for compliance with the standard.

Royalty-bearing licenses will be available to anyone who prefers that option."

Options...

- Does the WG want to reconsider the decision to not work on segmented content given the new IPR terms?
  - If so, do we want to accept draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has as a WG document?
  - If not, do we want to keep working on draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has in a different fashion? E.g. by trying to work around the IPR or by progressing the document as an independent submission?

Hum Test 1

- A: Hum now if you want the WG to stick to its current decision to **NOT** progress the “URI Signing for HAS” solution as Working Group material
- B: Hum now if you want the WG to revert its decision and progress the “URI Signing for HAS” solution as Working Group material

Questions In case A

- do we want to keep working on draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has in a different fashion? E.g. by trying to work around the IPR or by progressing the document as an independent submission?

Hum Test 2
(In case of B)

- Hum now if you want to accept draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has as a WG document
- Hum now if you do NOT want to accept draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has as a WG document