

ENUM Services Registration Guide

draft-ietf-enum-enumservices-guide-04

Bernie Hoeneisen
Alexander Mayrhofer
Jason Livingood

IETF-69, Chicago, IL, USA

Changes since -03

- Implemented conclusions from IETF-68
 - added section about extension of existing Enumservice RFCs
 - added open issue about future registration process
 - added category (bcp)
- Clean up in Security considerations
- Classification concept extended (still unstable)
- editorial stuff (mainly XML issues)

List of Open Issues

- a) Finalize / Stabilize classification concept
- b) Process for Enumservices registrations in absence of an IETF ENUM WG
- c) Address remaining issues raised by Jon Peterson (email 2007/07/05)
- d) What is the IANA impact of this document?
- e) Find appropriate URL for downloading the Template

ENUMservice classification

- Attempt to categorize existing and future ENUMservices
- Initially only there to understand / convey / categorize the different concepts
- Now more formal
(with recommendations for each category)
 - "protocol" class
 - "application" class
 - "data format" class

"Protocol" class ENUMservice

- Strongly related to a single (application level?) protocol
- ...and to a URI scheme for this protocol, potentially with a secure variant
- Recommendation:
 - Name: use protocol name
 - Type: use protocol name (lowercased)
 - Subtype: none for "base" URI scheme, URI scheme name for "other" URI schemes
- Examples: XMPP, SIP (...)

"Application" class ENUMservice

- Strongly tied to an application
(= „use case“, not an "application program")
- A single application might use more than one URI scheme
- Recommendations:
 - Name: application name
 - Type: application name (lowercased)
 - Subtype: URI scheme of protocol used
- Examples: mailto, web, ft, im (...)

"Data format" class ENUMservice

- Strongly tied to a specific data structure
- That data might be represented in various formats, and accessed via various protocols
- Recommendation:
 - Name: data structure name
 - Type: data structure name (lowercased)
 - Subtype: name of representation
- Example: vCard, cnam

Questions / comments so far ?

...before we'll talk about:

*“Process for Enumservices registrations in
absence of an IETF ENUM WG”*

Registration process

Issue:

- How will future Enumservices be registered (in absence of an IETF ENUM WG)?

Requirements for the process:

- To be defined

Where to put the process descriptions?

- This document (expand its scope)
- New document

Possible process (rough draft)

- 1) **Write a new I-D**, according to the principles set out in RFC3761 and draft-ietf-enum-enumservices-guide.
- 2) **Announce the I-D on the mailing list**
enum@ietf.org || enumservices-review@ietf.org || ...
- 3) **Feedback/review/discussion** on the list
- 4) **Submit the I-D** to
RFC editor || IESG || IANA || ...
- 5) **Expert review:**
At least one expert from a pool of Enumservices experts review the document/service.
- 6) If the expert(s) agree(s) that this is a useful service, and fulfills the requirements, the **document proceeds** to IESG evaluation || RFC Editor || IANA || ...

Open Questions (1/3)

- Which process applies?
 - IETF WG Submission
 - (sleeping) ENUM WG
 - RAI area WG or other WG
 - Independent submission
- To whom the I-D is submitted
 - IESG || IANA || RFC-Editor || ...
- Who is in charge of the process?
Who is the contact to the author(s)?
- Are there similar cases of the same problem to look into? e.g. MIME, URI schemes, EAP, DNS, ...

Note: According to RFC3761 Enumservice registrations needs to be Standards Track, Experimental or BCP

Open Questions (2/3)

Expert review:

- Do we want to have an expert review in the process?
 - If yes, at which state in the process the Expert review is performed?
 - What is the exact task of the expert(s) (just syntax, completeness, or also appropriateness and similar)?
 - What requirements the expert(s) will use a base for evaluation
 - Is expert review consultancy only or (preliminary) decision?
 - Who decides at the end? IESG? IANA?

Open Questions (3/3)

ENUM directorate (as alternative to experts)

- A directorate could perform reviews by request of the IESG. There are potentially two options for that:
 - a) Create a dedicated ENUM directorate
 - b) Approach the DNS directorate whether they could/would do the ENUMservices reviews
- Same questions as for expert review apply
- Actual question: Is the concept of a directorate viable for reviewing Enumservice registrations?

Links

- <http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-enum-enumservices-guide-04.txt>
- <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3761.txt>
- <http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-narten-iana-considerations-rfc2434bis-07.txt>
- <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4288.txt>
- <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4289.txt>
- <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3748.txt>
- <http://www.rfc-editor.org/indsubs.html>
- <ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/internet-drafts/draft-iab-rfc-independent-00.txt>
- <ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-editor/rfc-editor-process.gif>
- https://datatracker.ietf.org/images/state_diagram.gif