

Resource Directory

`draft-ietf-core-resource-directory`

Zach Shelby, Michael Koster, Carsten Bormann, Peter van der Stok,
Christian Amsüss

2018-11-05

From review and dependent document:

- ▶ Appendix “Modernized Link Format” is overstepping
- ▶ Groups are not used as described

Et cetera

- ▶ Security policies updated
- ▶ Plug test successful, only details remain,
Groups not tested
- ▶ Editorial changes

all in -16

Modernized Link Format

- ▶ redefined interpretation of RFC6690 links
- ▶ Background: Not implemented as specified (0/10)
- ▶ Instead: defined unambiguous subset
- ▶ Downside: Some use cases need to wait for CoRAL or similar, or depend on implementation specifics

see core-links-json

Group proposal

~~Groups: separate concept, enumerating membership~~

Groups: almost an endpoint (with endpoint type `et=core.gp`).
No members registered, but resources.

Group proposal

~~Groups: separate concept, enumerating membership~~

Groups: almost an endpoint (with endpoint type `et=core.gp`).
No members registered, but resources.

```
GET /rd-lookup/res?ep=my-group  
<coap://[ff05::8431]/light>;rt="light";...
```

Group proposal

~~Groups: separate concept, enumerating membership~~

Groups: almost an endpoint (with endpoint type `et=core.gp`).
No members registered, but resources.

```
GET /rd-lookup/res?ep=my-group  
<coap://[ff05::8431]/light>;rt="light";...
```

-17: Draft size -10%, compatible with implementations,
Groups described an usage pattern

Next steps for resource-directory

Does anyone use more than the limited subset of RFC6690?

Is anyone using pre -17 groups?

(no, no): publish version for WGLC