Changes since -01

• Editorial Issues
  – Slightly re-structured the document
    • Moved Changes and Open Issues to Appendices
  – Replaced numbers in examples with "Drama Numbers"
  – Replaced names in examples with John & Jane Doe

• Added collection of Open Issues / ToDo's to Appendix C

• Enhanced “Required Sections and Information” separated explanations and examples
Security Considerations

Issue:

a) There are security considerations applying to all ENUM services. How should we handle those?

Note: This probably has impact on issue g), which addresses document status to aim for: BCP, Informational, Standards Track

Options:

1) Repeat same security considerations in every service registration (e.g. put them to the template)

2) Reference them
   A) 3761bis
   B) ENUM services guide
   C) Separate document
Type and Subtype

b) Should a subtype always be mandatory?
   - yes / no

c) If answer to b) is “no”:
   How do we treat cases, where type:subtypeA has the same semantics as type without any subtype
   - e.g. “foo:bar” means the same as “foo”, but something else as “foo:cinema”
   - Any special considerations on this?

d) Should separate subtypes have separate registrations?
   - yes / no
Subtype and Uri Scheme

e) Does URI scheme always match subtype (consequence: only one URI scheme per subtype)?
   - **MUST** / **SHOULD** / **no**

f) If answer to e) is “SHOULD” or “no”:
   Should separate URI schemes have separate registrations?
   - **yes** / **no**
Other Issues

g) What document status are we aiming to?
   - BCP / Informational / Standards Track

h) Should this document update RFC 3761 (bis)?
   - yes / no

i) Statement on non-terminal NAPTR needed?
   - yes / no

j) Add something about “experimental” ENUM services?
   - yes (what specifically?) / no

k) Add something about extension of existing ENUM services?
   - yes (what specifically?) / no

l) What is the IANA impact of this document?