Known "Issues"

- who validates a namespace?
- what are the rules for namespace-eligibility?
- what is returned in URN resolution and/or how does a client specify what it wants as a result?

Proposed Charter (Cont'd)

- **Oct 96**
  - Revised versions of URN Framework, NAPTR documents.
  - Draft description of one namespace.
- **Nov 96**
  - Review revised versions of documents, and namespace proposal.
- **Dec 96**
  - Submit NAPTR proposal to IESG as Experimental RFC.
  - Submit Framework document to IESG for publication as an RFC.
- **Feb 97**
  - Submit namespace proposal to IESG for publication as an RFC.
- **Jul 97**
  - Review and revise documents as necessary.

Proposed Charter

The task for this working group is to describe the framework for a Uniform Resource Naming infrastructure, and its components.

The framework for URNs aims to be compliant with the requirements for URNs in RFC 1737. It provides mechanisms to allow global scope, persistence, independence, and legacy support. Participating Namespaces must provide global uniqueness and extensibility, but will vary in terms of degree of scalability and persistence.

Specifically, this WG will complete the description of the framework, outline one resolution registry system, and one namespace.

Next Steps

- Evaluate: is there anything here?
- If yes, proposed steps are:
  - flesh out framework document
  - robustify NAPTR work
  - describe at least one proposed namespace, in the context of the framework document

This is starting to sound like a WG charter...

Context

Framework, NAPTR I-D's:

- Several meetings (alphabetically): Leslie Daigle, Ron Daniel, David Ely, Patrik Faltstrom, Renato Iannella, Dirk van Gulik, Dan Laliberte, Michael Mealling, Keith Moore, Keith Shafer, Michael Shapiro, Reed Wade, Stuart Weibel, Chris Weider, Ted Wolf
- Framework: general infrastructure, resolution independent of naming, etc
- NAPTR: one implementation of a type of registry that would fit in the framework
- Follow-on to the work reported at the Dallas IETF

Girod/Sollins I-D:

- represents work carried out independently
- includes critique of NAPTR proposals
- healthy overlap between the 2 efforts

Definitions (Cont'd)

URNs **do not solve** (directly):

- disappeared resources
- evaluation of resource equivalence
- searching and indexing

URNs **do** solve:

- handling migration of resource location
- providing multiple locations
- fault tolerance for resolution
- multiple resolvers (over space and time)
- independence from transport protocol

Definitions

URNs **are not**:

- user friendly names
- a directory service
- tightly coupled to resolution
- one-one mapping from name to resource

URNs **are**:

- stable resource names
- long-lived
- identifiers
- location-independent
- free of semantics

Agenda

- Welcome, context *Leslie, 5 minutes*
- Framework document (draft-ietf-daigle-urnframework-00.txt) *Patrik Faltstrom, 15 minutes*
- NAPTR document (draft-ietf-daniel-naptr-01.txt) *Michael Mealling, Ron Daniel, 15 minutes*
- Next steps *Leslie, 10 minutes*
- Girod/Sollins paper – suggestions for improvements to the framework/NAPTR stuff *Karen Sollins, Lewis Girod, 15 minutes*
- Discussion of other proposed improvements for the current proposals. *General, 30 minutes*
- Closure on WG charter plan *General, 30 minutes*

URN BOF

Uniform Resource Naming

36th IETF, Montreal, Canada
June 27, 1996