

## TS 2021.010 | Paymail: BRFC IDs as element names in Capabilities Document

<b>Subject</b>	BRFC IDs as element names in Capabilities Document
<b>Date</b>	@currentDate
<b>Approver</b>	@ Andy Mee (Unlicensed)
<b>Contributors</b>	@ Miguel Duarte @ darrkellen @ Austin (MrZ) Rappaport @ Curtis Ellis
<b>Outcome</b>	To use BRFC IDs as element names for extensions declared in the JSON Capabilities Document
<b>Rationales for the decision</b>	<p>BRFC IDs were used in the original 2019 specification. The problem that they solved was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No requirement for an authoritative body to assign specification numbers (e.g. IETF assigning RFC IDs, Core contributors assigning BIP numbers, etc)</li><li>• Avoids ambiguity or collisions between capability configuration declared in unrelated standards (eg two standards defining an element named "key" or "kx" or similar names)</li><li>• Explicit versioning support as the version number affects the BRFC ID; extension versioning and implementation support are not ambiguous</li><li>• In 2019, a set of capabilities were in the base standard, and were given natural names ("paymentDestination" etc). These are no longer part of the Paymail core, and so the disambiguation between core and extension is no longer pertinent</li><li>• Capabilities Document is designed to be read by machines, not people, so unique identifiers are an appropriate</li><li>• It is anticipated that developers will defer to libraries already developed when supporting extensions, and that few client or server implementors will ever interact directly with the raw Capabilities Document. Therefore, human-readable identifiers are not perceived to be of benefit</li></ul>
<b>Comments</b>	