

Minutes of the URNBIS Working Group

IETF 87 Berlin, Germany

2 August 2013 1120 – 1220

Co-Chair Andrew Newton

Minute Taker Heather Flanagan

Andrew opened the meeting with the new IETF Note Well slide and notice, presented the agenda and asked for any proposed modifications to it. No modifications were proposed or made to the agenda.

Peter Saint-Andre presented draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc2141bis-urn-05. He noted the recent compromise where query and fragment identifier components will be allowed but not as a part of the NSS. He noted that equivalence is still an open issue and suggested simply referring to equivalence as defined in RFC 3986. There were no comments or questions regarding this presentation.

Peter Saint-Andre then presented the latest issues with draft-ietf-urnbis-rfc3406bis-urn-ns-reg-06. He noted the need for a better Security Considerations section.

Discussion in the room then centered around requirements for registering a new URN namespace and lowering the registration policy from RFC Required to Expert Review or Specification Required. Barry Leiba recommended Expert Review, noting that some namespace registrations need a specification and others do not. He suggested putting in guidance to the expert reviewers as to when to ask applicants for a specification.

Larry Masinter asked that applicants promise to abide by registration norms, persistence, unique registrations, and other qualities that separate a URN from other URIs.

Room discussion then focused on the namespace registration template, instructions on the template, and guidance to be given to expert reviewers when evaluating the templates. Peter Saint-Andre noted that concepts could be taken from draft-ipfix-iedoctors.

There was then a discussion of the composition of an expert review team or panel in contrast an individual expert reviewer, with many session participants agreeing to be part of a team of reviewers.

John Klensin, via Jabber, requested that promises by applicants be made in the registration template and that a specification be strongly preferred or that a reason be given why a specification is not being offered.

Peter Saint-Andre continued discussion of the rfc3406bis draft by noting Marc Blanchet had recently published a draft regarding changes needed to the URN namespace registration template, and noted more information needed to be moved inside the template. Barry noted that getting to the templates from the IANA website is not easy and that there are efforts to work with IANA to make them “clickable”. Peter noted that the Marc Blanchet’s documented noted that the current template does not match current practice.

SM, via Jabber, suggested that expert reviewers talk directly with the applicants and not require that applicants rely only on RFC text for guidance.

John Klensin, via Jabber, asked that if an applicant were to not give a specification, then the IANA template should include a short report from the expert panel. It was noted that “permanence without documentation is nonsense.”

The chair then discussed the next steps for the working group. Both 2141bis and 3406bis documents would receive new revisions with 2141bis likely headed to working group last call shortly after that. Andrew noted that it was unlikely the working group would need further meetings.

Without any other business presented, the working group session concluded early.