Network Working Group Request for Comments: 3349 Dover Beach Consulting, Inc. BCP: 59 Category: Best Current Practice

M. Rose July 2002

A Transient Prefix for Identifying Profiles under Development by the Working Groups of the Internet Engineering Task Force

Status of this Memo

This document specifies an Internet Best Current Practices for the Internet Community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2002). All Rights Reserved.

## Abstract

As a part of their deliverables, working groups of the IETF may develop BEEP profiles. During the development process, it is desirable to assign a transient identifier to each profile. If the profile is subsequently published as an RFC, then a permanent identifier is subsequently assigned by the IANA.

Rose

Best Current Practice

[Page 1]

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction				•							3
2.	Practice											3
3.	Security Considerations											4
	References											4
Α.	Acknowledgements											5
в.	IANA Considerations											5
	Author's Address											5
	Full Copyright Statement											6

Best Current Practice

[Page 2]

## 1. Introduction

Each BEEP profile [1] is identified by a URI [2]. The BEEP specification uses URIs to identify a BEEP profile both:

- o statically, when a profile is formally defined (RFC 3080's Section 5.1); and,
- o dynamically, during channel management (RFC 3080's Section 2.3.1).

If the BEEP profile appears on the standards-track [3], then the IANA is responsible for assigning the URI associated with the BEEP profile. Otherwise, the entity specifying the BEEP profile is free to assign a URI under its administration to the profile.

If a working group of the IETF is developing a BEEP profile, then, during the development process, it is desirable to use a transient identifier for the profile. Further, it is desirable that the transient identifier be associated with the working group.

This memo defines the practice for making such an assignment. Note that this practice does not apply to activities outside of working groups -- anyone able to assign a URL is capable of defining a URI for the purposes of identifying the BEEP profiles that they develop.

2. Practice

When a working group is formed, the IETF secretariat assigns a brief mnemonic prefix to the working group, e.g., "provreg" or "sacred".

When a working group begins development of a document which specifies a BEEP profile, the working group chair assigns a transient identifier of the form "http://iana.org/beep/transient/XXX/YYY" where "XXX" is the working group's mnemonic and "YYY" is a unique string. Although the resulting URI must conform to the URI syntax, the "YYY" portion is otherwise arbitrary. For example, it may contain a subhierarchy (e.g., "epp/1.0").

For example,

http://iana.org/beep/transient/provreg/epp/1.0 http://iana.org/beep/transient/sacred/pdm

might be assigned by the chairs of the "provreg" and "sacred" working groups, respectively.

Following this, the working group chair completes a BEEP profile registration template, and submits this information to the IANA.

Rose

Best Current Practice

[Page 3]

Note that although the IETF hasn't established a practice with respect to the use of capitalization in URLs employed for namespace purposes, the W3C has a lowercase-only policy. Working group chairs are encouraged to consider this when making assignments.

3. Security Considerations

This document describes an administrative convention and raises no additional security considerations. Of course, each BEEP-based protocol has its own set of security considerations, which should be described in the relevant specification.

References

- [1] Rose, M., "The Blocks Extensible Exchange Protocol Core", RFC 3080, March 2001.
- [2] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R. and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax", RFC 2396, August 1998.
- [3] Hovey, R. and S. Bradner, "The Organizations Involved in the IETF Standards Process", BCP 11, RFC 2028, October 1996.

Best Current Practice

Appendix A. Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of: Dan Kohn and Bob Wyman.

Appendix B. IANA Considerations

The IANA maintains a registry of transient identifiers used for BEEP profiles under development in the IETF, using the profile registration template defined in Section 5.1 of [1].

Note that unlike the registration procedures defined in Appendix B of [1], the working group chair (instead of the IESG) is responsible for authorizing the registration.

Author's Address

Marshall T. Rose Dover Beach Consulting, Inc. POB 255268 Sacramento, CA 95865-5268 US

Phone: +1 916 483 8878 EMail: mrose@dbc.mtview.ca.us

Best Current Practice

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2002). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

Best Current Practice

[Page 6]