REPUTE Document Status

Murray S. Kucherawy

<msk@cloudmark.com>

Initial Document Set

- #1: draft-kucherawy-reputation-model
  - Based on Nathaniel Borenstein's framework model posted to the domainrep list some time ago
  - Lays out the framework for REPUTE protocols and gives examples
  - Recommend we bring this in as a WG item, with Nathaniel editing

Initial Document Set

- #2: draft-kucherawy-reputation-media-type
  - Creates an object called a "reputon" and registers a media type for it
  - Lays out a simple text format for including one in a MIME part
    - Defines a basic parameter set
  - Also creates a registry for reputation applications and sets out what needs to go in them
  - Recommend we bring this in as a WG item, with me editing

Initial Document Set

- #3: draft-kucherawy-reputation-query-http
  - Specifies how to ask for a reputon over an HTTP or HTTPS query
  - Defines an XML form for a reputon
  - Registers a well-known URI (see RFC5785) for getting a query template (see draft-gregorio-uritemplate)
  - Defines a required but extensible set of parameters for completing the template
  - Recommend we bring this in as a WG item, with me editing

Initial Document Set

- #4: draft-kucherawy-reputation-vocab-identity
  - Creates the email identity reputation application, per the other draft
  - Allows reporting of reputations about identities found in email
    - Client IP address, DKIM domain, SPF domain, envelope sender domain, From: field domain
    - Defines various related parameters
  - Recommend we bring this in as a WG item, with me editing

Initial Document Set

- #5: draft-kucherawy-reputation-vocab-email
  - Creates the email property reputation application, per the other draft
  - Allows reporting of reputations about arbitrary properties found in email
  - Probably not needed, at least not for this charter
  - Recommend we let this expire

Initial Document Set

- #6: draft-kucherawy-reputation-query-dns and draft-kucherawy-reputation-query-udp
  - Placeholders for the "lightweight" query mechanism that we're debating on a couple of levels
  - There are competing views about whether or not the DNS is the right place for this kind of data
  - There's the usual argument against the likely success of a new service (i.e., port number) that people will have to support
  - Recommend we figure out which one we want and adopt it as a WG item, with someone other than me editing

The One We Don't Have Yet

- The charter requires us to produce a draft including guidelines about "data transparency, redress, meta-reputation and other important operational considerations"

- We don't have an initial document for this yet

- Does someone want to edit that one? It shouldn't be me…