

local-civic

Brian Rosen
James Winterbottom
Martin Thomson
Robins George

How to extend PIDF without new namespace

- Basic idea (very old idea, part of original PIDF-LO) is create a new namespace, with new CAtypes in the new namespace
- Problem – how to pass via DHCP?
- Problem – how to avoid explosion of incompatible types

No new numeric CAtypes

- The registry will no longer register new numeric CAtypes
- New mechanism to pass namespace + tag in DHCP
- Extension CAtype is defined, with numeric value
- Extension CAtype passes namespace+tag +value via DHCP

Draft includes –lamp-post and -prefix

- This draft incorporates the definitions of CAtypes from –lamp-post and –prefix
- Uses the new extension CAtype, not new numeric values
- Works as examples of how to register CAtypes using new registry rules.

List discussion on the registry

- I (Brian) want to distinguish between CAtypes that are general use, and all clients SHOULD implement them and CAtypes that are specialized use, the registry merely prevents duplication and clients MAY implement them
- I propose Standards Track for “Type A” and expert review for “Type B”
- The Type would be a column in the registry and the only significance to Type A would be “SHOULD implement”