Network Working Group Internet-Draft

Intended status: BCP Expires: June 20, 2013 A. Forte
AT&T
H. Schulzrinne
Columbia University
December 17, 2012

# Policy for defining new service-identifying lables draft-ietf-ecrit-service-urn-policy-01.txt

#### Abstract

In order to provide location-based services, descriptive terms for services need to be defined. This document updates the policy for defining new service-identifying labels.

#### Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$  78 and  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$  79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <a href="http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/">http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/</a>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on June 20, 2013.

# Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}\ 78}$  and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<a href="http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info">http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</a>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Internet-Draft	Service URN Policy	December 2012
----------------	--------------------	---------------

# Table of Contents

<u>1</u> .	Introduction
<u>2</u> .	Requirements notation
<u>3</u> .	Guidelines for the creation of new top-level services $3$
<u>4</u> .	IANA Considerations
<u>5</u> .	Security Considerations
<u>6</u> .	References
Auth	nors' Addresses

#### 1. Introduction

Nowadays location-based services are widespread. Devices can detect a user location and retrieve all available services in the sourroundings of that location. A particular service can be described by one or multiple terms such as "restaurant", "parking" and "ATM machine". All such terms, however, need to be formally defined so that a registry can be built and used to assure consistency and compatibility between devices and between service providers. Since descriptive terms for services are almost unbounded, such registry would contain the most common terms. In this document we update the policy for defining new terms, that is new service-identifying labels.

# 2. Requirements notation

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

# 3. Guidelines for the creation of new top-level services

The number of services that can be defined is very large. New services, however, SHOULD at least satisfy the following guidelines.

- The service has to be of general interest;
- It should not be specific to a particular country or region;
- The language in which the new service is defined MUST be English (this is a protocol token, not meant to be shown to humans);
- The newly defined services SHOULD correspond to a standard statistical classification of enterprises or services, such as the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

#### 4. IANA Considerations

This document updates Section 4.1 of [RFC5031] in that the policy for adding top-level service labels is "Expert Review". The expert is designated by the RAI Area Director.

# **5**. Security Considerations

This document does not raise security issues.

## 6. References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", <u>BCP 14</u>, <u>RFC 2119</u>, March 1997.

[RFC5031] Schulzrinne, H., "A Uniform Resource Name (URN) for Emergency and Other Well-Known Services", RFC 5031, January 2008.

## Authors' Addresses

Andrea G. Forte AT&T Security Research Center 33 Thomas Street New York, NY 10007 USA

Email: forte@att.com

Henning Schulzrinne Columbia University Department of Computer Science 1214 Amsterdam Avenue, MC 0401 New York, NY 10027 USA

Email: hgs@cs.columbia.edu