URNBIS Working Group

IETF 80 - Prague, CZ
31 March 2011, Thursday 13:00-15:00

Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- The IETF plenary session
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Agenda

1. Agenda Bashing (5 min)

2. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc2141bis-urn-00 (20 min)

3. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3406bis-urn-ns-reg-00 (20 min)

4. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3187bis-isbn-urn-00 (20 min)

5. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3188bis-nbn-urn-00 (20 min)

6. URN extension for media content naming (10 min)

7. Charter Discussion (10 min)

8. Any Other Business

(proposed) Agenda

1. Agenda Bashing (5 min)

2. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc2141bis-urn-00 (20 min)

3. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3406bis-urn-ns-reg-00 (20 min)

4. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3187bis-isbn-urn-00 (20 min)

5. draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3188bis-nbn-urn-00 (20 min)

6. Discussion of 3044bis (10 min)

7. URN extension for media content naming (10 min)

8. Charter Discussion (10 min)

9. Any Other Business

2141bis Discussion

Issue Categories

- Fragments

- Everything else

Everything Else

- Reserve "nid" and "iri" NIDs

- Human transcribability & readability

- ABNF for NID

  - more than one *segment* (thus allowing '/')

  - 32 character limit

- Allow '@', '&', and '~' into NSS

Fragments

- Some URN namespaces currently use fragments

- URN namespace maintainers would like to continue using fragments

- But... RFC 3986 says fragments are dependent on the media type being resolved

The Need for Fragements

- Greatly reduces the number of URNs needed in some namespaces

  - easier namespace management

- Example cited: reduces one reference from 420 URNs to 1.

  - fragments for figures appearing in a text book.

  - library of 10m books: 4.2bn -> 10m URNs

The Juha Compromise

- Namespace maintainers must specify the media types to be resolved thus making legal the fragments for said media types in their URNs.

- To add new media types to their namespace, they must update their namespace registration.

3406bis Discussion

Issue Categories

- Formal, Informal, and Experimental namespaces and their relevance to persistent identifiers

- Everything else

Everything Else

- Acceptance criteria for organizations to be assigned a namespace

    - practical experience in identifier management

    - "authority" over the proposed NID

    - show technical competency in namespace resolution

- NIDs should be well known acronyms if possible and not in conflict with acronyms of other known identifier systems.

- ABNF for Formal & Informal patterns

- Provide a draft for the 'example' namespace

(In)Formal/Experimental and Persistence

- Should there be an ability to withdraw informal namespaces?

- A sub-registry for "historic" namespaces?

- Disallow further experimental namespace registrations?

  - so what about the current ones?

  - what is meant by an experimental URN namespace

- If URNs are to be persistent, how can their namespaces be removed under any of the above items?

Charter Discussion

A Wise Man Once Said

"The Working Group's contract with the IESG (a.k.a. "the charter") was expressly negotiated based on the assumption that the URNBIS WG would finish its work on revising RFC 2141 and RFC 3406 before moving on to the more complicated and contentious topic of URN resolution. Let's focus on the work described in the current charter. If folks really want to start working on URN resolution, they should put some of their energy into 2141bis and 3406bis (e.g., by providing document reviews or logging issues in the tracker) so that we can finish those deliverables and then talk about rechartering the WG to include work on resolution."

-- Peter Saint-Andre

in a message to urn@ietf.org on 24 March 2011