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.