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Changes since -03

- Implemented conclusions from IETF-68
  - added section about extension of existing Enumservice RFCs
  - added open issue about future registration process
  - added category (bcp)

- Clean up in Security considerations

- Classification concept extended (still unstable)

- Editorial stuff (mainly XML issues)
List of Open Issues

a) Finalize / Stabilize classification concept

b) Process for Enumservices registrations in absence of an IETF ENUM WG

c) Address remaining issues raised by Jon Peterson (email 2007/07/05)

d) What is the IANA impact of this document?

e) Find appropriate URL for downloading the Template
ENUMservice classification

• Attempt to categorize existing and future ENUMservices

• Initially only there to understand / convey / categorize the different concepts

• Now more formal (with recommendations for each category)
  − "protocol" class
  − "application" class
  − "data format" class
"Protocol" class ENUMservice

• Strongly related to a single (application level?) protocol

• ...and to a URI scheme for this protocol, potentially with a secure variant

• Recommendation:
  – Name: use protocol name
  – Type: use protocol name (lowercased)
  – Subtype: none for "base" URI scheme, URI scheme name for "other" URI schemes

• Examples: XMPP, SIP (…)
"Application" class ENUMservice

- Strongly tied to an application
  ( = „use case“, not an "application program")
- A single application might use more than one URI scheme
- Recommendations:
  - Name: application name
  - Type: application name (lowercased)
  - Subtype: URI scheme of protocol used
- Examples: mailto, web, ft, im (…)
"Data format" class ENUMservice

- Strongly tied to a specific data structure
- That data might be represented in various formats, and accessed via various protocols
- Recommendation:
  - Name: data structure name
  - Type: data structure name (lowercased)
  - Subtype: name of representation
- Example: vCard, cnam
Questions / comments so far?

...before we'll talk about:
“Process for Enumservices registrations in absence of an IETF ENUM WG”
Registration process

Issue:

- How will future Enumservices be registered (in absence of an IETF ENUM WG)?

Requirements for the process:
- To be defined

Where to put the process descriptions?
- This document (expand its scope)
- New document
Possible process (rough draft)

1) Write a new I-D, according to the principles set out in RFC3761 and draft-ietf-enum-enumservices-guide.

2) Announce the I-D on the mailing list
   enum@ietf.org || enumservices-review@ietf.org || ...

3) Feedback/review/discussion on the list

4) Submit the I-D to
   RFC editor || IESG || IANA || ...

5) Expert review:
   At least one expert from a pool of Enumservices experts review the document/service.

6) If the expert(s) agree(s) that this is a useful service, and fulfills the requirements, the document proceeds to IESG evaluation || RFC Editor || IANA || ...
Open Questions (1/3)

• Which process applies?
  – IETF WG Submission
    • (sleeping) ENUM WG
    • RAI area WG or other WG
  – Independent submission

• To whom the I-D is submitted
  – IESG || IANA || RFC-Editor || ...

• Who is in charge of the process?
  Who is the contact to the author(s)?

• Are there similar cases of the same problem to look into? e.g. MIME, URI schemes, EAP, DNS, ...

Note: According to RFC3761 Enumservice registrations needs to be Standards Track, Experimental or BCP
Open Questions (2/3)

Expert review:

- Do we want to have an expert review in the process?
  - If yes, at which state in the process the Expert review is performed?
  - What is the exact task of the expert(s) (just syntax, completeness, or also appropriateness and similar)?
    - What requirements the expert(s) will use a base for evaluation
  - Is expert review consultancy only or (preliminary) decision?
  - Who decides at the end? IESG? IANA?
Open Questions (3/3)

ENUM directorate (as alternative to experts)

- A directorate could perform reviews by request of the IESG. There are potentially two options for that:
  a) Create a dedicated ENUM directorate
  b) Approach the DNS directorate whether they could/would do the ENUMservices reviews
- Same questions as for expert review apply
- Actual question: Is the concept of a directorate viable for reviewing Enumservice registrations?