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Agenda

• Agenda Bashing, scribes, blue sheets, etc.  (5 mins)
• Problem summary  (5 mins)
• Review of draft-lafon-rfc2616bis-03.txt:
  • status and open issues [1] (20 mins)
• Review of existing HTTP authentication
  • mechanisms [2] (15 mins)
• Review of issues with HTTP caching and cookies (10 mins)
• Review of ETags on write issues (5 mins)
• General discussion about formation of the WG (10 mins)
  • - if no interest in the WG, then spend more time
  • on discussing 2616bis issues
• Is revision of RFC 2617 in scope for the WG? (20 mins)
• Should rewrite of RFC 2616 be allowed by the Charter? (20 mins)
• When, if and how interop work should take place (10 mins)
• Other issues with the proposed Charter (10 mins)
• Closing discussion about formation of the WG (20 mins)

Total: 150 minutes
HTTP Authentication

- e.g. anonymous read of documents doesn't require any authentication
- write (PUT/DELETE/...) would require ...
Rules of engagement

• Target: move RFC 2616 and possibly other HTTP related RFCs to Draft standard
  – NO NEW FEATURES
  – Remove unused/broken features
  – Clarify things which are unclear
  – Fix contradictions
  – “Small” functional changes for interop problems are fine
• (side-effect) suggest replacement for features which can't be fixed, but work will not be done in the same WG *(not before rechartering anyway)*
Lisa
Revise RFC 2617?

- RFC 2617 defines Basic and Digest authentication
- Yes – revise both in HTTPbis WG
- Yes – revise Basic only
- No (can be revised in another WG or as individual submission)

- [Cyrus to talk to about splitting RFC 2617 into 3 parts]
Rewrite RFC 2616 from scratch?

- Yes
- No
- Decide later (compare draft-lafon-rfc2616bis with a full rewrite)
  - Deadline for the new draft (full rewrite) is needed
Other RFCs to be revised by the WG?

• RFC 2965 - HTTP State Management Mechanism
  – Yes
  – No (or maybe later after rechartering)
• RFC 2818 (HTTP TLS)
• RFC 2817 (Upgrade to TLS in HTTP)
Other documents to be produced by the WG?

- Document problems with caching, cookies?
- Document problems with Etags?
- Document Best Practice for selected difficult issues
Is there any interest to form one or more WGs?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe (more discussion needed)