

draft-ietf-enum-experiences-00.txt

IETF60 ENUM-WG
2004/8/04

Kazunori Fujiwara, JPRS <fujiwara@jprs.co.jp>
Lawrence Conroy, Roke Manor Research <lwc@roke.co.uk>

draft-ietf-enum-experiences-00 status

- become working group draft

- Updated from draft-conroy-enum-experiences-01.txt

- Added new items which fujiwara pointed at Seoul IETF meeting

- Separated into "Server" side issues and "Client" side issues

- Server: ENUM zone population side

- ▷ Number holder MUST write valid data in DNS.

- Client: ENUM data lookup side

- ▷ To be safe and avoid bugs, Clients MAY ignore unrecognized DNS data

- Because clients must accept any data from DNS without crashing

- Assume bad guys may write malicious data in DNS.

Issues from the original draft

□ 2.2. Case Sensitivity

- SHOULD NOT assume that the field delimiter is the last character (CLIENT)

□ 3.2. Treatment of NAPTRs with identical ORDER/PRIORITY values

- SHOULD process all NAPTRs (CLIENT)

□ 4.2. Non-final NAPTRs - loop detection and response

- SHOULD parse 5 non-final NAPTRs (CLIENT)

New issues (1)

- 2.1 Character Sets - Non-ASCII considered harmful (NEW)
 - SHOULD use ASCII characters (IDN and URI specific ascii encoding)
 - Client MAY ignore NAPTR RR which contains Non-ASCII

- 2.3 Regexp field delimiter (from seoul)
 - Use '!' (SERVER)
 - Client MAY ignore NAPTR RR whose delimiter is not '!' .

- 2.4 Regexp meta-character issue (from seoul)
 - escape meta character \+ (SERVER)

New issues (2)

- 3.1. Order/Priority values - general processing
 - use fixed ORDER 100 (from seoul)

- 4.1. Non-final NAPTRs - general issues (from seoul)
 - (details are explained later)

- 5. Backward Compatibility (NEW)
 - 5.1. Service field syntax:
 - ▷ MUST populate RFC3761 style data (SERVER)
 - ▷ MUST accept RFC3761 style (CLIENT)
 - ▷ SHOULD accept RFC2916 style (CLIENT)

Open Issues

□ 4.1 Non-Final processing - general issues

○ To support non-final DDDS NAPTRs:

- non-final NAPTR's service field SHOULD be ignored.
- error processing in DDDS non-final NAPTRs must be consistent

○ but, Non-final NAPTR processing is expensive and cause large delay in Telephone switches and embeded terminals

○ therefore, some may not be able to support non-final NAPTRs

○ I-D authors' recommend:

- SHOULD NOT generate non-final NAPTRs (SERVER)
- MAY discard non-final NAPTRs (CLIENT)

Need comments

- ☐ Beware - there are some typos in the draft.
 - Those we have noticed have been posted to the list.
- ☐ Please check and post to the list or mail the authors.