

URNBIS Working Group
Thursday, March 31, 2011, 1300-1500
Chairs: Andrew (Andy) Newton, Alfred Hoenes
Applications Area Advisor: Peter Saint-Andre
Scribe: Ted Hardie

1. Andy presented the published agenda and proposed two additional items: a discussion on the revision of RFC 3044 (3044bis) and a presentation by Larry Masinter on the W3C Technical Architecture Group. No objections to the modification of the agenda were heard, and the agenda changes were accepted.

2. Andy led a discussion of draft-ietf-rfc2141bis based on feedback seen on the mailing list, stating that current issues fell into two categories: fragments and everything else.

The group discussed the encoding of NSS values. Alfred argued for mnemonic NSS values but stated no desire they be designed for transcription. There was also a discussion of the scope of the allowed changes, with Alfred referencing the working groups charter.

Andy then led a discussion on URN fragments, noting the mailing list objections to fragments and the conflict with RFC 3986. Andy noted the given use case for fragments which would allow URN namespace maintainers to reduce the number of URNs in their resolution systems. Andy walked through Juha Hakala's compromise to have URN maintainers specify the media representations to avoid the RFC 3986 conflict.

Peter Saint-Andre spoke as the Area Advisor and noted the working group had to take into consideration broader IETF community needs and breaking syntax for a specific subset would be problematic. Larry questioned the given use case, and noted that namespace maintainers could use other characters to denote subdivisions in their namespaces for better namespace management and did not need to rely on misusing URI fragment identifiers. He also noted that the W3C TAG had been discussing fragments, saying that the original vision of the World Wide Web was about static documents but now the World Wide Web is made up of lots of "active content". This active content may present itself as one media type but actually reference another.

Leslie Daigle stated her belief that any fragment use must be architectural. Juha stated that fragments must be name-space specific. Ted Hardie suggested that resources contained within other resources should be referenceable with respect to the containing resources; that the real need is the ability to synthesize; fragments relate to the representation, but creating a mechanism to generalize the ability to describe talking about contained resources would be useful, though distinct.

3. Andy led a discussion of draft-ietf-rfc3406bis based on feedback seen on the mailing list.

The group discussed experimental namespaces, with Andy noting it was suggested on the mailing list that they should be dropped. Juha stated that dropping experimental namespaces is a reduction in specified URN functionality and such change was outside the scope of the working group's charter. He also stated that they were useful for bringing new namespaces to stability, with Leslie concurring that experimental namespaces should continue to be allowed.

Larry questions the distinction between the service of registering a name and the service of resolving that name. Juha notes that many people using urns are in need of long-term identifiers -- perhaps lasting centuries, but that URNs don't have that functionality at the moment. He believes that a service level agreement

should be built in as well.

4. Juha led a discussion of draft-ietf-rfc3187bis.

Juha briefly described the usage of ISBNs, even noting that some bookstores assign them to merchandice such as teddy bears because their system only allow them to sell ISBN items. He stated that ISBN has two version, ISBN-10 and ISBN-13. The second was needed to add capacity and is compatible with barcode standards. He stated that revival of the ISBN work has been put on hold until syntax in 2141bis has been finalized.

5. Juha led a discussion of draft-ietf-rfc3188bis.

He stated there was a need to shift local identifiers into a global identifier system, and noted that tens of millions of NBNs have been assigned. He noted the use of NBNs in the Finnish system.

6. Pierre Godefroy talked about revisions to RFC 3044 (a 3044bis item is part of the working groups milestones). He noted that ISSN-1 has been created, and the mechanism in RFC 3044 has been short lived. He stated his belief that the RFC should be revised to denote service levels rather than mechanism.

7. Feng Cao then discussed draft-cao-urn-media-content-naming-delivery (this draft was not published in time for IETF draft cut-off, however a link to it was sent to the URN mailing list). Feng described the work on using content identifiers in Peer-to-Peer applications, noting they use URN prefixes but are inconsistent and non-standard.

Ted Hardi suggested that a better solution would be a new URI scheme rather than subsets of a URN. Larry noted his opinion that URNs without a namespace authority were a mistake, stating that in his own work he concluded an administrative choice was needed other than DNS. Bohle Ohlman pointed out that there still might be a need for a context independent naming scheme.

8. Larry gave a short discussion of the W3C TAG's thoughts, noting he does not necessarily agree with them. He noted that the TAG has historically had an urge to use HTTP URIs for naming, rather than minting namespace mechanisms.

9. The charter discussion originally scheduled in the agenda did not take place because the working group ran out of time.